arXiv:1112.3708v1 [math.RT] 16 Dec 2011

Path Model for Representations of Generalized Kac–Moody Algebras

MOTOHIRO ISHII

Graduate School of Pure and Applied Sciences, University of Tsukuba,
Tsukuba, Ibaraki 305-8571, Japan
(e-mail: `ishii731@math.tsukuba.ac.jp`)

Abstract

In [**JL**], Joseph and Lamprou generalized Littelmann's path model for Kac–Moody algebras to the case of generalized Kac–Moody algebras. We show that Joseph–Lamprou's path model can be embedded into Littelmann's path model for a certain Kac–Moody algebra constructed from the Borcherds–Cartan datum of a given generalized Kac–Moody algebra; note that this is not an embedding of crystals. Using this embedding, we give a new proof of the isomorphism theorem for path crystals, obtained in [**JL**, §7.4]. Moreover, for Joseph–Lamprou's path crystals, we give a decomposition rule for tensor product and a branching rule for restriction to Levi subalgebras. Also, we obtain a characterization of standard paths in terms of a certain monoid, which can be thought of as a generalization of a Coxeter group.

1 Introduction.

The quantized universal enveloping algebra $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ associated with a symmetrizable Kac–Moody algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ was introduced independently by V. G. Drinfel'd ([**D**]) and M. Jimbo ([**Ji**]). It is a non-commutative and non-cocommutative Hopf algebra that can be thought of as a q-deformation of the universal enveloping algebra $U(\mathfrak{g})$ of $\mathfrak{g}$. Also, G. Lusztig ([**Lu**]) and M. Kashiwara ([**Kas1-4**]) independently developed the theory of crystal bases (or canonical bases). In particular, crystal bases can be regarded as bases at the limit "$q = 0$", where many of the problems in representation theory can be reduced to combinatorial ones.

In [**JKK, JKKS, Kan**], a theory parallel to the above was developed for generalized Kac–Moody algebras, which is a new class of infinite-dimensional Lie algebras introduced by R. Borcherds in his study of the Conway–Norton monstrous moonshine ([**B1-2, CN**]). The representation theory of generalized Kac–Moody algebras are very similar to that of Kac–Moody algebras, and many results for Kac–Moody algebras can be extended to the case of generalized Kac–Moody algebras. However, there indeed exist some differences between these Lie algebras.

In particular, generalized Kac–Moody algebras have *imaginary simple roots*, which have norms at most 0; they cause some pathological phenomenons.

Motivated by the crystal basis theory, P. Littelmann introduced the path model for integrable highest weight modules over the quantized universal enveloping algebra of a symmetrizable Kac–Moody algebra ([**Li1-2**]). Soon afterward, it was shown in [**Jo, Kas5**] that Littelmann's path model provides a combinatorial realization of crystal bases of integrable highest weight modules. In Littelmann's path model, each crystal basis element is realized as a *Lakshmibai–Seshadri path* (*LS path* for short), which is a pair of a decreasing sequence of Weyl group elements (in the Bruhat order) and an increasing sequence of rational numbers in [0,1], with certain integrality conditions. In [**JL**], A. Joseph and P. Lamprou generalized Littelmann's path model to the case of generalized Kac–Moody algebras. They introduced *generalized Lakshmibai–Seshadri paths* (*GLS paths* for short), and considered the crystal $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ of all GLS paths of shape λ. Moreover, they showed that the (formal) character of $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ coincides with the generating function for the weights given by the Weyl–Kac–Borcherds character formula for the integrable highest weight module with highest weight λ over a generalized Kac–Moody algebra.

In this paper, we introduce a new tool, which we call an *embedding of path models*. This is an embedding of the path crystal $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ of GLS paths of shape λ for a given generalized Kac–Moody algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ into the path crystal $\widetilde{\mathbb{B}}(\tilde{\lambda})$ of ordinary LS paths of shape $\tilde{\lambda}$ for a certain Kac–Moody algebra $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$; note that this is not an embedding of crystals. As an application of this embedding, we give a new proof of the isomorphism theorem for path crystals, obtained in [**JL**, §7.4]; in fact, this is a special case of the following more general result:

Theorem 1.0.1 *Let $\lambda \in P^+$ be a dominant integral weight, and let $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n \in P$ be integral weights such that $\lambda = \lambda_1 + \cdots + \lambda_n$, and such that the concatenation $\pi_{\lambda_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \pi_{\lambda_n}$ of the straight-line paths $\pi_{\lambda_1}, \dots, \pi_{\lambda_n}$ is a dominant path, i.e., $\bigl(\pi_{\lambda_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \pi_{\lambda_n}\bigr)(t) \in \sum_{\eta \in P^+} \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\eta$ for all $t \in [0,1]$. Then, we have an isomorphism of crystals:*

$$\mathbb{B}(\lambda) \cong \mathcal{F}(\pi_{\lambda_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \pi_{\lambda_n}),$$

where $\mathcal{F} := \langle f_i \mid i \in I \rangle_{\mathrm{monoid}}$ is the monoid generated by lowering root operators f_i, $i \in I$ (see §3.1).

In this paper, we assume that the Borcherds–Cartan matrix is symmetrizable and the diagonal entries are all even. First, we associate a certain monoid $\mathcal{W}$ with a given Borcherds–Cartan matrix, which can be thought of as a generalization of a Coxeter group; indeed, this monoid has many nice combinatorial properties such as the (Strong) *Exchange Property*, *Deletion Property*, *Word Property*, and *Lifting Property*. Then, we give a characterization of standard paths in terms of the *Bruhat order* on the monoid $\mathcal{W}$, generalizing the corresponding result [**Li3**, Theorem 10.1] for Kac–Moody algebras, due to P. Littelmann. By using this characterization of standard paths, we recover the crystal isomorphism theorem between Joseph–Lamprou's path crystal and the crystal basis of the integrable highest weight $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module, which is a special case of Theorem 1.0.1, as follows.

Theorem 1.0.2 *We have the following isomorphism of crystals:*

$$\mathbb{B}(\lambda) \cong B(\lambda),$$

where $B(\lambda)$ denotes the crystal basis of the integrable highest weight $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module $V(\lambda)$ with highest weight $\lambda \in P^+$.

Consequently, we obtain an embedding:

$$B(\lambda) \hookrightarrow \widetilde{B}(\tilde{\lambda}),$$

where $\widetilde{B}(\tilde{\lambda})$ denotes the crystal basis of the integrable highest weight $U_q(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$-module $\widetilde{V}(\tilde{\lambda})$ with highest weight $\tilde{\lambda}$. This embedding is not necessarily a morphism of crystals. However, it is a *quasi-embedding* of crystals in the sense of §4.1 below; for the precise statement, see §4 and §6.

By using these results, we obtain the following decomposition rules.

Theorem 1.0.3 (Decomposition Rule for tensor products).

$$\mathbb{B}(\lambda) \otimes \mathbb{B}(\mu) \;\cong\; \bigsqcup_{\substack{\pi \in \mathbb{B}(\mu) \\ \tilde{\pi}\,:\,\tilde{\lambda}\text{-dominant}}} \mathbb{B}\big(\lambda + \pi(1)\big).$$

Here, $\tilde{\pi} \in \widetilde{\mathbb{B}}(\tilde{\mu})$ denotes the image of $\pi \in \mathbb{B}(\mu)$ under the embedding $\mathbb{B}(\mu) \hookrightarrow \widetilde{\mathbb{B}}(\tilde{\mu})$, and it is said to be $\tilde{\lambda}$-dominant if $\tilde{\pi}(t) + \tilde{\lambda}$ belongs to the dominant Weyl chamber of $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ for all $t \in [0,1]$.

Theorem 1.0.4 (Branching Rule for restriction to Levi subalgebras). *For a subset $S \subset I$, we denote by $\mathfrak{g}_S$ the corresponding Levi subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$, by $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{\widetilde{S}}$ the one for $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ (see §7.2), and by $\mathbb{B}_S(\lambda)$ the set of GLS paths of shape λ for $\mathfrak{g}_S$. Then,*

$$\mathbb{B}(\lambda) \;\cong\; \bigsqcup_{\substack{\pi \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda) \\ \tilde{\pi}\,:\,\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{\widetilde{S}}\text{-dominant}}} \mathbb{B}_S\big(\pi(1)\big) \quad \text{as } \mathfrak{g}_S\text{-crystals.}$$

Here, $\tilde{\pi} \in \widetilde{\mathbb{B}}(\tilde{\lambda})$ denotes the image of $\pi \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ under the embedding $\mathbb{B}(\lambda) \hookrightarrow \widetilde{\mathbb{B}}(\tilde{\lambda})$, and it is said to be $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{\widetilde{S}}$-dominant if $\tilde{\pi}(t)$ belongs to the dominant Weyl chamber of $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{\widetilde{S}}$ for all $t \in [0,1]$.

Note that these theorems extend the corresponding (well-known) results for Kac–Moody algebras (see [**Kas1-2,4, Li1-2**]).

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we recall some elementary facts about generalized Kac–Moody algebras, and introduce the monoid $\mathcal{W}$. In Section 3, we review Joseph–Lamprou's path model. In Section 4, we introduce our main tool, which we call an embedding of path models, and then give a new proof of the isomorphism theorem for path crystals. In Section 5, we give a characterization of standard paths. In Section 6, we prove that the crystal of GLS paths of shape λ is isomorphic to the crystal basis of the integrable highest weight module with highest weight λ. In Section 7, we obtain some decomposition rules for path crystals for generalized Kac–Moody algebras. In the Appendix, we give the (postponed) proofs of results on the monoid $\mathcal{W}$ stated in Section 2.

Acknowledgments.

This paper is a part of the author's master thesis, which was written under the supervision of Professor Satoshi Naito. The author would like to express his sincere thanks to Professor Satoshi Naito and Professor Daisuke Sagaki for suggesting the problems taken up in this paper and for many helpful discussions.

2 Preliminaries.

2.1 Generalized Kac–Moody algebras.

In this subsection, we recall some fundamental facts about generalized Kac–Moody algebras. For more details, we refer the reader to [**Bo1-2, JKK, JKKS, Kac, Kan**].

Let I be a countable index set. We call $A = (a_{ij})_{i,j \in I}$ a *Borcherds–Cartan matrix* if the following three conditions are satisfied: (1) $a_{ii} = 2$ or $a_{ii} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\leq 0}$ for each $i \in I$; (2) $a_{ij} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\leq 0}$ for all $i, j \in I$, with $i \neq j$; (3) $a_{ij} = 0$ if and only if $a_{ji} = 0$ for each $i, j \in I$, with $i \neq j$.

An index $i \in I$ is said to be *real* if $a_{ii} = 2$, and *imaginary* if $a_{ii} \leq 0$. Denote by $I^{re} := \{i \in I \mid a_{ii} = 2\}$ the set of real indices, and by $I^{im} := \{i \in I \mid a_{ii} \leq 0\} = I \setminus I^{re}$ the set of imaginary indices. A Borcherds–Cartan matrix A is said to be *symmetrizable* if there exists a diagonal matrix $D = \operatorname{diag}(s_i)_{i \in I}$, with $s_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, such that DA is symmetric. Also, if $a_{ii} \in 2\mathbb{Z}$ for all $i \in I$, then A is said to be *even*. Throughout this paper, we assume that a Borcherds–Cartan matrix A is symmetrizable and even.

For a given Borcherds–Cartan matrix $A = (a_{ij})_{i,j \in I}$, a *Borcherds–Cartan datum* is a quintuple $\big(A, \mathit{\Pi} := \{\alpha_i\}_{i \in I}, \mathit{\Pi}^\vee := \{\alpha_i^\vee\}_{i \in I}, P, P^\vee\big)$, where $\mathit{\Pi}$ and $\mathit{\Pi}^\vee$ are the sets of *simple roots* and *simple coroots*, respectively, $P^\vee$ is a *coweight lattice*, and $P := \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}}(P^\vee, \mathbb{Z})$ is a *weight lattice*.

We set $\mathfrak{h} := P^{\vee} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{C}$, and call it the *Cartan subalgebra.* Let $\mathfrak{h}^* := \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathfrak{h}, \mathbb{C})$ denote the full dual space of $\mathfrak{h}$. In this paper, we assume that $\Pi^{\vee} \subset \mathfrak{h}$ and $\Pi \subset \mathfrak{h}^*$ are both linearly independent over $\mathbb{C}$. Let $P^+ := \{\lambda \in P \mid \alpha_i^{\vee}(\lambda) \geq 0 \text{ for all } i \in I\}$ be the set of dominant integral weights, and $Q := \bigoplus_{i \in I} \mathbb{Z}\alpha_i$ the *root lattice*; we set $Q^+ := \sum_{i \in I} \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\alpha_i$. Also, we write $\mu \succ \nu$ if $\mu - \nu \in Q^+$. Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be the generalized Kac–Moody algebra associated with a Borcherds–Cartan datum $(A, \Pi, \Pi^{\vee}, P, P^{\vee})$. We have the root space decomposition $\mathfrak{g} = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \mathfrak{h}^*} \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha}$, where $\mathfrak{g}_{\alpha} := \{x \in \mathfrak{g} \mid \mathrm{ad}(h)(x) = h(\alpha)x \text{ for all } h \in \mathfrak{h}\}$, and $\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{g}_0$. Denote by $\Delta := \big\{\alpha \in \mathfrak{h}^* \bigm| \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha} \neq \{0\},\ \alpha \neq 0\big\}$ the root system, and by Δ^+ the set of positive roots. Note that $\Delta \subset Q \subset P$ and $\Delta = \Delta^+ \sqcup (-\Delta^+)$. Also, we define a Coxeter group $\mathcal{W}_{re} := \langle r_i \mid i \in I^{re} \rangle_{\text{group}} \subset \mathrm{GL}(\mathfrak{h}^*)$, where r_i for $i \in I^{re}$ is a simple reflection, and set $\Delta_{im} := \mathcal{W}_{re}\Pi_{im}$, where $\Pi_{im} := \{\alpha_i\}_{i \in I^{im}}$; note that $\Delta_{im} \subset \Delta^+$. In addition, we set $\Delta_{re} = \mathcal{W}_{re}\Pi_{re}$, where $\Pi_{re} := \{\alpha_i\}_{i \in I^{re}}$, and $\Delta_{re}^+ := \Delta_{re} \cap \Delta^+$; note that Δ_{re} is the set of real roots. As in the case of ordinary Kac–Moody algebras, it is easily checked that the coroot $\beta^{\vee} := w\alpha_i^{\vee}$ of $\beta = w\alpha_i \in \Delta_{re}^+ \sqcup \Delta_{im}$ is well-defined.

2.2 The monoid $\mathcal{W}$ and its properties.

In this subsection, we introduce a certain monoid, which can be thought of as a generalization of a Coxeter group. Furthermore, we obtain some combinatorial properties of this monoid. Since several results stated in this subsection are not used explicitly in this paper, we postpone giving the proofs of these results to the Appendix.

Let $i \in I^{im}$. If we define $r_i \in \mathrm{GL}(\mathfrak{h}^*)$ by $r_i(\mu) := \mu - \alpha_i^{\vee}(\mu)\alpha_i$ for $\mu \in \mathfrak{h}^*$, then the inverse of r_i is as follows:

$$r_i^{-1}(\mu) = \mu + \frac{1}{1 - a_{ii}}\alpha_i^{\vee}(\mu)\alpha_i \text{ for } \mu \in \mathfrak{h}^*.$$

Note that this r_i has an infinite order in $\mathrm{GL}(\mathfrak{h}^*)$. Still, we can verify that the element $r_{\beta} := w r_i w^{-1} \in \mathrm{GL}(\mathfrak{h}^*)$ for $\beta = w\alpha_i \in \Delta_{re}^+ \sqcup \Delta_{im}$ and $w \in \mathcal{W}_{re}$, is well-defined. By convention, we call r_{β} the reflection with respect to the root β.

Definition 2.2.1 *Let $\mathcal{W}$ denote the monoid generated by the symbols $\tilde{r}_i$, $i \in I$, subject to the following relations:*

(1) $\tilde{r}_i^2 = 1$ for all $i \in I^{re}$;

(2) if $i, j \in I^{re}$, $i \neq j$, and the order of $r_i r_j \in \mathrm{GL}(\mathfrak{h}^*)$ is $m \in \{2, 3, 4, 6\}$, then $(\tilde{r}_i\tilde{r}_j)^m = (\tilde{r}_j\tilde{r}_i)^m = 1$;

(3) if $i \in I^{im}$, $j \in I \setminus \{i\}$, and $a_{ij} = 0$, then $\tilde{r}_i\tilde{r}_j = \tilde{r}_j\tilde{r}_i$.

Let $\ell : \mathcal{W} \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ denote the length function. From the definition, we have the following (well-defined) homomorphism of monoids:

$$\mathcal{W} \longrightarrow \mathrm{GL}(\mathfrak{h}^*),\ \tilde{r}_i \longmapsto r_i\ (i \in I).$$

By abuse of notation, we also write r_i for $\tilde{r}_i$ in $\mathcal{W}$.

In order to study properties of the monoid $\mathcal{W}$, we introduce a Coxeter group $\mathfrak{W}$.

Definition 2.2.2 *We set* $\tilde{I} := \{i^{(1)}\}_{i \in I^{re}} \sqcup \{i^{(n)}\}_{i \in I^{im}, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}}$. *Let* $\mathfrak{W}$ *denote the Coxeter group associated with the Coxeter matrix* $X = \big(x_{i^{(n)},j^{(m)}}\big)_{i^{(n)},j^{(m)} \in \tilde{I}}$ *given by:*

(1) $x_{i^{(n)},i^{(n)}} = 1$ *for all* $i^{(n)} \in \tilde{I}$;

(2) if $i, j \in I^{re}$, *then* $x_{i^{(1)},j^{(1)}}$ *is the order of* $r_i r_j$ *in* $\mathrm{GL}(\mathfrak{h}^*)$;

(3) if $i \in I^{im}$, *then* $x_{i^{(n)},j^{(m)}} = x_{j^{(m)},i^{(n)}} = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } a_{ij} = 0, \\ \infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$

for $j^{(m)} \in \tilde{I} \setminus \{i^{(n)}\}$ *and* $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$.

We denote by $\ell : \mathfrak{W} \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ the length function.

For notational simplicity, we use "multi-index" notation. We write $\mathbf{i}^{(\mathbf{m})} = \big(i_k^{(m_k)}, \dots, i_2^{(m_2)}, i_1^{(m_1)}\big)$ if $\mathbf{i} = (i_k, \dots, i_2, i_1) \in I^k$ and $\mathbf{m} = (m_k, \dots, m_2, m_1) \in \mathbb{Z}^k$ for $k \geq 0$, and call it an *ordered index* if $m_r = 1$ for $i_r \in I^{re}$, and if $m_{x_s} = s$ for those $s = 1, 2, \dots, t$, with $1 \leq x_1 < x_2 < \cdots < x_t \leq k$ such that $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t\} = \{x \mid i_x = i,\ 1 \leq x \leq k\}$ for $i \in I^{im}$. We set $\mathcal{I} := \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} I^k$, $\widetilde{\mathcal{I}} := \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \tilde{I}^k$, and denote by $\widetilde{\mathcal{I}}_{\mathrm{ord}}$ the set of all ordered indices $\mathbf{i}^{(\mathbf{m})}$. Note that if $\mathbf{i}^{(\mathbf{m})} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{I}}_{\mathrm{ord}}$, then $\mathbf{m}$ is determined uniquely by $\mathbf{i}$. Therefore, we have a bijection $\mathcal{I} \to \widetilde{\mathcal{I}}_{\mathrm{ord}},\ \mathbf{i} \mapsto \mathbf{i}^{(\mathbf{m})}$. Now, we define a subset $\mathfrak{V} \subset \mathfrak{W}$ by $\mathfrak{V} := \big\{r_{\mathbf{i}^{(\mathbf{m})}} \in \mathfrak{W} \bigm| \mathbf{i}^{(\mathbf{m})} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{I}}_{\mathrm{ord}}\big\}$, where $r_{\mathbf{i}^{(\mathbf{m})}} := r_{i_k^{(m_k)}} \cdots r_{i_2^{(m_2)}} r_{i_1^{(m_1)}}$ if $\mathbf{i} = (i_k, \dots, i_2, i_1)$ and $\mathbf{m} = (m_k, \dots, m_2, m_1)$. Also, we write $r_{\mathbf{i}} := r_{i_k} \cdots r_{i_2} r_{i_1} \in \mathcal{W}$ if $\mathbf{i} = (i_k, \dots, i_2, i_1)$.

Lemma 2.2.3 *The map (not necessarily a homomorphism of monoids) given below is bijective.*

$$\sigma : \mathcal{W} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{V},\ r_{\mathbf{i}} \longmapsto r_{\mathbf{i}^{(\mathbf{m})}},$$

where the $\mathbf{m}$ *for which* $\mathbf{i}^{(\mathbf{m})} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{I}}_{\mathrm{ord}}$ *is determined uniquely by* $\mathbf{i}$.

Observe that $\ell(w) = \ell\big(\sigma(w)\big)$ for each $w \in \mathcal{W}$, and that $\mathcal{W}_{re}$ and $\langle r_i \mid i \in I^{re} \rangle_{\mathrm{monoid}} \subset \mathcal{W}$ are isomorphic as groups. Hence we may (and do) regard the group $\mathcal{W}_{re}$ as a submonoid of $\mathcal{W}$. Also, it is clear that the correspondence, $\{w\tilde{r}_i w^{-1} \in \mathcal{W} \mid w \in \mathcal{W}_{re},\ i \in I\} \ni w\tilde{r}_i w^{-1} \mapsto w r_i w^{-1} \in \mathrm{GL}(\mathfrak{h}^*)$, is injective for all $w \in \mathcal{W}_{re}$ and $i \in I$. For this reason, we write $r_{w(\alpha_i)}$ for $w r_i w^{-1}$ in $\mathcal{W}$.

Definition 2.2.4 (cf. [**BB**, **Hu**]). *For* $w \in \mathcal{W}$ *and* $\beta \in \Delta_{re}^{+} \sqcup \Delta_{im}$, *we write* $w \to r_\beta w$ *or* $w \xrightarrow{\beta} r_\beta w$ *if* $\ell(r_\beta w) > \ell(w)$. *Also, we define a partial order* $\geq$ *on* $\mathcal{W}$ *as follows:* $w \leq w'$ in $\mathcal{W}$ *if there exist* $w_0, w_1, \dots, w_s \in \mathcal{W}$ *such that* $w = w_0 \to w_1 \to \cdots \to w_s = w'$. *We call this partial order on* $\mathcal{W}$ *the Bruhat order.*

Note that $w \to r_\beta w$ for all $w \in \mathcal{W}$ and $\beta \in \Delta_{im}$.

As a corollary of Lemma 2.2.3, we can show that the *Word Property* (cf. [**BB**, Theorem 3.3.1]) holds for $\mathcal{W}$. Also, the following *Exchange Property* (cf. [**BB, Hu**]) holds for $\mathcal{W}$.

Corollary 2.2.5 (Strong Exchange Property for real roots; cf. [**BB**, **Hu**]). *Let* $w := r_{i_1} \cdots r_{i_k} \in \mathcal{W}$. *If there exists* $\beta \in \Delta_{re}^{+}$ *such that* $\ell(r_\beta w) < \ell(w)$, *then there exists some* $i_t \in I^{re}$ *such that* $r_\beta w = r_{i_1} \cdots \widehat{r_{i_t}} \cdots r_{i_k}$, *where* $\widehat{r_{i_t}}$ *indicates that the* r_{i_t} *is omitted in the expression. Moreover, if* $r_{i_1} \cdots r_{i_k}$ *is a reduced expression, then the* $i_t \in I^{re}$ *above is uniquely determined.*

Corollary 2.2.6 (Strong Exchange Property for imaginary roots; cf. [**BB**, **Hu**]). *Let* $\beta := w\alpha_i \in \Delta_{im}$, $i \in I^{im}$, $w \in \mathcal{W}_{re}$, *and let* $v, v' \in \mathcal{W}$. *If* $v' \xrightarrow{\beta} v$, *then an expression of* v' *is obtained from the expression* $v = r_{i_k} \cdots r_{i_2} r_{i_1}$ *by omitting the leftmost* r_i, *i.e., if* $i = i_{x_1} = i_{x_2} = \cdots = i_{x_p}$ *with* $1 \leq x_1 < x_2 < \cdots < x_p \leq k$, *then* $v' = r_{i_k} \cdots \widehat{r_{i_{x_p}}} \cdots \cdots r_{i_{x_2}} \cdots r_{i_{x_1}} \cdots r_{i_1}$.

By an argument similar to the one for [**JL**, Lemma 2.2.3], we can show that $\mathcal{W}$ has the following property.

Lemma 2.2.7 (cf. [**JL**, Lemma 2.2.3]). *Let* $\lambda \in P^+$ *and* $i \in I^{im}$. *If there exists* $1 \neq w \in \mathcal{W}_{re}$ *such that* $r_i w\lambda \notin P^+$, *then there exists* $j \in I^{re}$ *such that* $r_i w \lambda = r_j r_i w' \lambda$, *where* $w' := r_j w$ *with* $\ell(w') = \ell(w) - 1$, *and such that* $r_i r_j = r_j r_i$ *in* $\mathcal{W}$. *Therefore, there exist* $w_1,\ w_2 \in \mathcal{W}_{re}$ *such that* $w = w_1 w_2$ *with* $\ell(w) = \ell(w_1) + \ell(w_2)$, *and such that* $r_i w_1 = w_1 r_i$ *in* $\mathcal{W}$, $r_i w_2 \lambda \in P^+$.

Definition 2.2.8 (cf. [**JL**, §2.2.6]). *Let* $w := w_0 r_{i_1} w_1 \cdots w_{k-1} r_{i_k} w_k \in \mathcal{W}$ *be a reduced expression, where* $i_1, \dots, i_k \in I^{im}$ *and* $w_0, w_1, \dots, w_k \in \mathcal{W}_{re}$. *We call this expression a dominant reduced expression if it satisfies*

$$r_{i_s} w_s r_{i_{s+1}} w_{s+1} \cdots w_{k-1} r_{i_k} w_k (P^+) \subset P^+$$

for all $s = 1, 2, \dots, k$.

Note that every $w \in \mathcal{W}$ has at least one dominant reduced expression. Indeed, if we choose an expression of the form above in such a way that the sequence $\big(\ell(w_k), \ell(w_{k-1}), \dots, \ell(w_0)\big)$ is minimal in lexicographic order among all the reduced expressions of the form above, then it is a dominant reduced expression by Lemma 2.2.7.

Lemma 2.2.9 (cf. [**JL**, Lemma 2.2.2]). *For every* $\lambda \in P^+$, *we have* $\mathrm{Stab}_{\mathcal{W}}(\lambda) := \{w \in \mathcal{W} \mid w(\lambda) = \lambda\} = \langle r_i \mid \alpha_i^\vee(\lambda) = 0 \rangle_{\mathrm{monoid}}$, *where the right-hand side is the monoid generated by those* $r_i,\ i \in I$, *for which* $\alpha_i^\vee(\lambda) = 0$.

3 Joseph–Lamprou's path model.

In this section, following [**JL**], we review Joseph–Lamprou's path model for generalized Kac–Moody algebras. Although some definitions are slightly modified from the original ones in [**JL**], the arguments in [**JL**] are still valid.

3.1 Root operators.

Let $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{R}}$ denote a real form of $\mathfrak{h}$, and let $\mathbb{P}$ be the set of all piecewise-linear continuous maps $\pi : [0,1] \longrightarrow \mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{R}}^*$ such that $\pi(0) = 0$, where we set $[0,1] := \{t \in \mathbb{R} \mid 0 \le t \le 1\}$. Also, we set $h_i^\pi(t) := \alpha_i^\vee\bigl(\pi(t)\bigr)$ for $t \in [0,1]$, and then $m_i^\pi := \min\{h_i^\pi(t) \mid t \in [0,1]\}$.

The following two lemmas are easily verified. Let $h : [0,1] \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a piecewise-linear continuous function.

Lemma 3.1.1 (cf. [**Li2**, §1]). *Let* $0 \le t_0 < t_1 \le 1$. *Suppose that* $h(t_0) < h(t)$ *for* $t \in (t_0, t_1]$, $h(t_1) \le h(t)$ *for* $t \in (t_1, 1]$, *and that there exists* $\varepsilon > 0$ *for which* $h(t)$ *is strictly increasing in* $(t_1 - \varepsilon, t_1]$. *Then, there exists a unique sequence* $t_0 =: s_0 < s_1 < \cdots < s_k < s_{k+1} := t_1$ *satisfying the following conditions:*

(1) for each $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots,$ $h(t)$ *is strictly increasing in* $[s_{2n}, s_{2n+1}]$, *and* $h(s_{2n+1}) \le h(t)$ *for* $t \in (s_{2n+1}, t_1]$;

(2) for each $n = 1, 2, 3, \dots,$ $h(s_{2n-1}) = h(s_{2n})$, $h(t) \ge h(s_{2n})$ *for* $t \in (s_{2n-1}, s_{2n})$, *and* $h(t) > h(s_{2n})$ *for* $t \in (s_{2n}, t_1]$.

Lemma 3.1.2 (cf. [**Li2**, §1]). *Let* $0 \le t_0 < t_1 \le 1$. *Suppose that* $h(t_1) < h(t)$ *for* $t \in [t_0, t_1)$, $h(t_0) \le h(t)$ *for* $t \in [0, t_0)$, *and that there exists* $\varepsilon > 0$ *for which* $h(t)$ *is strictly decreasing in* $[t_0, t_0 + \varepsilon)$. *Then, there exists a unique sequence* $t_0 =: s_0 < s_1 < \cdots < s_k < s_{k+1} := t_1$ *satisfying the following conditions:*

(1) for each $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots,$ $h(t)$ *is strictly decreasing in* $[s_{2n}, s_{2n+1}]$, *and* $h(s_{2n+1}) \le h(t)$ *for* $t \in [t_0, s_{2n+1})$;

(2) for each $n = 1, 2, 3, \dots,$ $h(s_{2n-1}) = h(s_{2n})$, $h(t) \ge h(s_{2n})$ *for* $t \in (s_{2n-1}, s_{2n})$, *and* $h(t) > h(s_{2n})$ *for* $t \in [t_0, s_{2n-1})$.

Let $\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_k \in \mathbb{P}$, and let $0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_{k-1} < 1$ be rational numbers. We define a path $(\pi_1)_0^{t_1} * \cdots * (\pi_k)_{t_{k-1}}^1$ by

$$\big((\pi_1)_0^{t_1} * \cdots * (\pi_k)_{t_{k-1}}^1\big)(t) := \begin{cases} \pi_1(t) & t \in [0, t_1], \\ \pi_2(t) + \big(\pi_1(t_1) - \pi_2(t_1)\big) & t \in [t_1, t_2], \\ \quad\vdots & \quad\vdots \\ \pi_k(t) + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1}\big(\pi_i(t_i) - \pi_{i+1}(t_i)\big) & t \in [t_{k-1}, 1]. \end{cases}$$

Also, for $w \in \mathrm{GL}(\mathfrak{h}^*)$ and $\pi \in \mathbb{P}$, define $w\pi \in \mathbb{P}$ by $(w\pi)(t) := w\big(\pi(t)\big)$ for $t \in [0,1]$. Now we define the root operators $e_i,\ f_i : \mathbb{P} \longrightarrow \mathbb{P} \sqcup \{\mathbf{0}\}$ for $i \in I$ as follows.

First, we set $f_+^i(\pi) := \max\{t \in [0,1] \mid h_i^\pi(t) = m_i^\pi\}$, and $f_-^i(\pi) := \min\{t \in [f_+^i(\pi), 1] \mid h_i^\pi(s) \geq m_i^\pi + 1 \text{ for all } s \in [t,1]\}$. Then it follows that $f_-^i(\pi)$ exists if and only if $h_i^\pi(1) \geq m_i^\pi + 1$. If $h_i^\pi(1) < m_i^\pi + 1$, then we set $f_i\pi := \mathbf{0}$. If $h_i^\pi(1) \geq m_i^\pi + 1$, then the interval $\big[f_+^i(\pi), f_-^i(\pi)\big]$ satisfies the condition for $[t_0, t_1]$ in Lemma 3.1.1, and hence there exists a unique sequence $0 \leq f_+^i(\pi) =: t_0 < s_1 < s_2 < \cdots < s_{2k} < t_1 := f_-^i(\pi) \leq 1$ satisfying the conditions (1) and (2) in Lemma 3.1.1. In this case, we set

$$f_i\pi := \pi_0^{f_+^i(\pi)} * (r_i\pi)_{f_+^i(\pi)}^{s_1} * \pi_{s_1}^{s_2} * (r_i\pi)_{s_2}^{s_3} * \cdots * \pi_{s_{2n-1}}^{s_{2n}} * (r_i\pi)_{s_{2n}}^{s_{2n+1}} * \cdots * (r_i\pi)_{s_{2k}}^{f_-^i(\pi)} * \pi_{f_-^i(\pi)}^1.$$

Next, we define the operator e_i for $i \in I^{re}$. Set $e_+^i(\pi) := \min\{t \in [0,1] \mid h_i^\pi(t) = m_i^\pi\}$, and $e_-^i(\pi) := \max\{t \in [0, e_+^i(\pi)] \mid h_i^\pi(s) \geq m_i^\pi + 1 \text{ for all } s \in [0,t]\}$. Then it follows that $e_-^i(\pi)$ exists if and only if $m_i^\pi \leq -1$. By taking the interval $\big[e_-^i(\pi), e_+^i(\pi)\big]$ for $[t_0, t_1]$ to apply Lemma 3.1.2, we can define the operator e_i for $i \in I^{re}$ in the same way as the operator f_i.

Finally, we define the operator e_i for $i \in I^{im}$. Set $e_-^i(\pi) := f_+^i(\pi)$, and $e_+^i(\pi) := \min\{t \in [e_-^i(\pi), 1] \mid h_i^\pi(s) \geq m_i^\pi + 1 - a_{ii} \text{ for all } s \in [t,1]\}$. Then it follows that $e_+^i(\pi)$ exists if and only if $h_i^\pi(1) \geq m_i^\pi + 1 - a_{ii}$. If $h_i^\pi(1) < m_i^\pi + 1 - a_{ii}$, then we set $e_i\pi := \mathbf{0}$. If $h_i^\pi(1) \geq m_i^\pi + 1 - a_{ii}$, then the interval $\big[e_-^i(\pi), e_+^i(\pi)\big]$ satisfies the condition for $[t_0, t_1]$ in Lemma 3.1.1. In this case, by using r_i^{-1} instead of r_i, we can define the operator e_i for $i \in I^{im}$ in the same way as the operator e_i for $i \in I^{re}$.

3.2 Generalized Lakshmibai–Seshadri paths.

Let $\lambda \in P^+$. We write $\mu \xrightarrow{\beta} \nu$ for $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{W}\lambda$ if there exists a (unique) $\beta \in \Delta_{re}^+ \sqcup \Delta_{im}$ such that $\mu = r_\beta \nu$ and $\beta^\vee(\nu) > 0$. Then we define a partial order $\geq$ on $\mathcal{W}\lambda$ to be the transitive closure of this (covering) relation. From the definitions, it follows that the natural surjection $\mathcal{W} \longrightarrow \mathcal{W}\lambda$ respects the partial orders on $\mathcal{W}$ and $\mathcal{W}\lambda$. In [**JL**], Joseph–Lamprou generalized the notion of Lakshmibai–Seshadri paths to the case of generalized Kac–Moody algebras as follows.

Definition 3.2.1 ([**JL**, §5.2.1]). *For a rational number* $a \in (0,1]$ *and* $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{W}\lambda$ *with* $\mu \geq \nu$, *an* a*-chain for* (μ, ν) *is a sequence* $\mu =: \nu_0 \xrightarrow{\beta_1} \nu_1 \xrightarrow{\beta_2} \cdots \xrightarrow{\beta_s} \nu_s := \nu$ *of elements in* $\mathcal{W}\lambda$ *such that for each* $i = 1, 2, \ldots, s$, $a\beta_i^\vee(\nu_i) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ *if* $\beta_i \in \Delta_{re}^+$, *and* $a\beta_i^\vee(\nu_i) = 1$ *if* $\beta_i \in \Delta_{im}$.

Note that if there exists an a-chain for (μ, ν), then we have $a(\mu - \nu) \in -Q^+$.

Definition 3.2.2 ([**JL**, §5.2.2]). *Let* $\boldsymbol{\lambda} := (\lambda_1 > \lambda_2 > \cdots > \lambda_s)$ *be a sequence of elements in* $\mathcal{W}\lambda$, *and* $\boldsymbol{a} := (0 = a_0 < a_1 < \cdots < a_s = 1)$ *a sequence of rational numbers. Then, the pair* $\pi := (\boldsymbol{\lambda}; \boldsymbol{a})$ *is called a generalized Lakshmibai–Seshadri path (GLS path for short) of shape* λ *if it satisfies the following conditions (called the chain condition):* (i) *there exists an* a_i*-chain for* $(\lambda_i, \lambda_{i+1})$ *for each* $i = 1, 2, \ldots, s-1$; (ii) *there exists a* 1*-chain for* (λ_s, λ).

In this paper, we regard the pair $\pi = (\boldsymbol{\lambda}; \boldsymbol{a})$ as a path belonging to $\mathbb{P}$ by $\pi(t) := \sum_{i=1}^{j-1}(a_i - a_{i-1})\lambda_i + (t - a_{j-1})\lambda_j$ for $a_{j-1} \leq t \leq a_j$ and $j = 1, 2, \ldots, s$. Note that $\pi(1) \in \lambda - Q^+$. We denote by $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ the set of all GLS paths of shape λ.

Remark 3.2.3 *Note that the GLS path* π *is an integral and monotone path (see* [**JL**, §5.3.7–§5.3.9]*), i.e.,* $m_i^\pi \in \mathbb{Z}_{\leq 0}$, *and the function* $h_i^\pi(t)$ *is monotone in the intervals* $[f_i^+(\pi), f_i^-(\pi)]$ *and* $[e_i^-(\pi), e_i^+(\pi)]$ *for all* $i \in I$. *Hence, by the definition of the root operators, it follows that the effect of our root operators on GLS paths coincides with that of Joseph–Lamprou's root operators in* [**JL**].

3.3 Crystal structure on $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$.

In this subsection, we define a crystal structure on $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$. Although our definition of root operators is slightly different from the original one in [**JL**], the resulting two crystal structures on $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ agree by Remark 3.2.3.

Let $\pi = (\boldsymbol{\lambda}; \boldsymbol{a}) = (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_s; 0 = a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_s = 1) \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ be a GLS path of shape λ. In this paper, we allow repetitions in $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ and $\boldsymbol{a}$ for convenience; namely, we assume that $\lambda_1 \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_s$ and $0 = a_0 \leq a_1 \leq \cdots \leq a_s = 1$.

We set $f_\pm^i := f_\pm^i(\pi)$ for $i \in I$. Then it follow that $f_+^i = a_t$ for some $0 \leq t \leq s$. Also, if $f_i\pi \in \mathbb{P}$, then $a_{p-1} \leq f_-^i \leq a_p$ for some $t+1 \leq p \leq s$.

Proposition 3.3.1 ([**JL**, Proposition 6.1.2]). *Fix* $i \in I^{re}$, *and let* $\pi \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ *be as above. If* $f_i\pi \in \mathbb{P}$, *then*

$$f_i\pi = (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_t, r_i\lambda_{t+1}, \ldots, r_i\lambda_p, \lambda_p, \ldots, \lambda_s;\ a_0, \ldots, a_{p-1}, f_-^i, a_p, \ldots, a_s),$$

and, moreover, $f_i\pi \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda)$.

Proposition 3.3.2 ([**JL**, Proposition 6.1.3]). *Fix $i \in I^{im}$, and let $\pi \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ be as above. If $f_i\pi \in \mathbb{P}$, then*

$$f_i\pi = (r_i\lambda_1, \dots, r_i\lambda_p, \lambda_p, \dots, \lambda_s;\ a_0, \dots, a_{p-1}, f_-^i, a_p, \dots, a_s).$$

Moreover, in this case, $f_i\pi \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ and $\alpha_i^\vee(\lambda_1) = \alpha_i^\vee(\lambda_2) = \cdots = \alpha_i^\vee(\lambda_p) = \frac{1}{f_-^i}$. Hence we have

$$f_i\pi = \Big(\lambda_1 - \frac{\alpha_i}{f_-^i}, \dots, \lambda_p - \frac{\alpha_i}{f_-^i}, \lambda_p, \dots, \lambda_s;\ a_0, \dots, a_{p-1}, f_-^i, a_p, \dots, a_s\Big).$$

From this proposition, we see that the action of f_i on $\pi \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ is determined completely by f_-^i, and that r_i (resp., r_i^{-1}) commutes with the reflections with respect to the positive roots appearing in a-chains of π for $0 < a \le f_-^i$.

We set $e_\pm^i := e_\pm^i(\pi)$ for $i \in I$. Then it follows that $e_+^i = a_k$ for some $0 \le k \le s$. Now, let $i \in I^{re}$. If $e_i\pi \in \mathbb{P}$, then we have $a_{q-1} \le e_-^i \le a_q$ for some $0 \le q \le k$.

Proposition 3.3.3 ([**JL**, Proposition 6.2.1]). *Fix $i \in I^{re}$, and let $\pi \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda)$. If $e_i\pi \in \mathbb{P}$, then*

$$e_i\pi = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_q, r_i\lambda_q, \dots, r_i\lambda_k, \lambda_{k+1}, \dots, \lambda_s;\ a_0, \dots, a_{q-1}, e_-^i, a_q, \dots, a_s),$$

and, moreover, $e_i\pi \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda)$.

Next, we fix $i \in I^{im}$. Note that $e_i\pi \in \mathbb{P}$ does not necessarily imply $e_i\pi \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda)$.

Proposition 3.3.4 *Fix $i \in I^{im}$, and let $\pi \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda)$. If $e_i\pi \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda)$, then*

$$e_i\pi = (r_i^{-1}\lambda_1, \dots, r_i^{-1}\lambda_k, \lambda_{k+1}, \dots, \lambda_s;\ a_0, \dots, a_{k-1}, e_+^i = a_k, \dots, a_s).$$

Moreover, in this case, $e_+^i\alpha_i^\vee(\lambda_k) = 1 - a_{ii}$ and $\alpha_i^\vee(\lambda_1) = \alpha_i^\vee(\lambda_2) = \cdots = \alpha_i^\vee(\lambda_k) = \frac{1-a_{ii}}{e_+^i} > 0$. Hence we have

$$e_i\pi = \Big(\lambda_1 + \frac{\alpha_i}{e_+^i}, \dots, \lambda_k + \frac{\alpha_i}{e_+^i}, \lambda_{k+1}, \dots, \lambda_s;\ a_0, \dots, a_{k-1}, e_+^i = a_k, \dots, a_s\Big).$$

From this proposition, we see that the action of e_i on $\pi \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ is determined completely by e_+^i, and that r_i (resp., r_i^{-1}) commutes with the reflections with respect to the positive roots appearing in a-chains of π for $0 < a \le e_+^i = a_k$.

We only give the proof of Proposition 3.3.4; for the proofs of Propositions 3.3.1–3.3.3, we refer the reader to [**JL**, §6.1–§6.2]. For this purpose, we need the following refinement of [**JL**, Lemma 7.3.6].

Lemma 3.3.5 *Let $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{W}\lambda$, and let $a \in (0,1]$ be a rational number, $\mu =: \nu_0 \xrightarrow{\beta_1} \nu_1 \xrightarrow{\beta_2} \cdots \xrightarrow{\beta_s} \nu_s := \nu$ an a-chain for (μ, ν). If there exists $\beta_l = w\alpha_i$ with $i \in I^{im}$ and $w \in \mathcal{W}_{re}$ such that $a\alpha_i^\vee(\mu) \leq 1 - a_{ii}$ in this a-chain, then $\beta_l = \alpha_i$ and $a\alpha_i^\vee(\mu) = 1 - a_{ii}$. Therefore, $r_i^{-1}\mu \in \mathcal{W}\lambda$, and there exists an a-chain for $\big(r_i^{-1}\mu, \nu\big)$.*

Proof. Suppose the contrary, i.e., that $a\alpha_i^\vee(\mu) < 1 - a_{ii}$. In addition, suppose that $\beta_l = w\alpha_i \neq \alpha_i$. If we write $\beta_l = w\alpha_i = \alpha_i + \beta$ for some $\beta \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\mathit{\Pi}_{re} \setminus \{0\}$, then it follows that $\alpha_i^\vee(\beta) \leq -1$, and hence $\alpha_i^\vee(\beta_l) = a_{ii} + \alpha_i^\vee(\beta) \leq a_{ii} - 1$. Also, we have $1 - a_{ii} > a\alpha_i^\vee(\mu) = a\alpha_i^\vee(\nu_l) - a\beta_l^\vee(\nu_l)\alpha_i^\vee(\beta_l) - \sum_{q=1}^{l-1} a\beta_q^\vee(\nu_q)\alpha_i^\vee(\beta_q) \geq a\alpha_i^\vee(\nu_l) + (1 - a_{ii}) - \sum_{q=1}^{l-1} a\beta_q^\vee(\nu_q)\alpha_i^\vee(\beta_q)$. Therefore, we obtain $0 > a\alpha_i^\vee(\nu_l) - \sum_{q=1}^{l-1} a\beta_q^\vee(\nu_q)\alpha_i^\vee(\beta_q) \geq 0$, which is a contradiction. Thus, we must have $\beta_l = \alpha_i$. In this case, we have $1 - a_{ii} > a\alpha_i^\vee(\mu) = a\alpha_i^\vee(\nu_l) - a\alpha_i^\vee(\nu_l)\alpha_i^\vee(\alpha_i) - \sum_{q=1}^{l-1} a\beta_q^\vee(\nu_q)\alpha_i^\vee(\beta_q) = 1 - a_{ii} - \sum_{q=1}^{l-1} a\beta_q^\vee(\nu_q)\alpha_i^\vee(\beta_q)$, and hence $0 > -\sum_{q=1}^{l-1} a\beta_q^\vee(\nu_q)\alpha_i^\vee(\beta_q) \geq 0$, which is again a contradiction. Thus, we must have $a\alpha_i^\vee(\mu) = 1 - a_{ii}$. Consequently, it follows from [**JL**, Lemma 7.3.6] that $r_i^{-1}\mu \in \mathcal{W}\lambda$ and that there exists an a-chain for $(r_i^{-1}\mu, \nu)$. $\square$

For $\mu = \lambda - \sum_{i \in I} m_i\alpha_i \in \lambda - Q^+$, we set $\mathrm{depth}_i^\lambda(\mu) := m_i$.

Proof of Proposition 3.3.4.

Suppose the contrary, i.e., that $e_+^i < a_k$. Then, there exists an e_+^i-chain for $(r_i^{-1}\lambda_k, \lambda_k)$. In particular, $r_i^{-1}\lambda_k > \lambda_k$. Also, we have $r_i(r_i^{-1}\lambda_k) = \lambda_k$, and $\alpha_i^\vee(r_i^{-1}\lambda_k) = \alpha_i^\vee\big(\lambda_k + \frac{1}{1-a_{ii}}\alpha_i^\vee(\lambda_k)\alpha_i\big) = \frac{1}{1-a_{ii}}\alpha_i^\vee(\lambda_k) > 0$. Therefore, we obtain $r_i^{-1}\lambda_k \xleftarrow{\alpha_i} \lambda_k$, which is a contradiction. Hence we conclude that $e_+^i = a_k$. In this case, we have $a_k\alpha_i^\vee(\lambda_k) \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $a_k\alpha_i^\vee(\lambda_k) \leq 1 - a_{ii}$. Indeed, if this is not the case, then $h_i^\pi(t) = 1 - a_{ii}$ for some $t < e_+^i$ since $\alpha_i^\vee(\lambda_1) \geq \alpha_i^\vee(\lambda_2) \geq \cdots \geq \alpha_i^\vee(\lambda_k) > 0$, which is absurd.

Observe that we have the original $a_k(= e_+^i)$-chain $\lambda_k := \nu_s \xrightarrow{\beta_{s-1}} \cdots \xrightarrow{\beta_1} \nu_1 =: \lambda_{k+1}$, and also a sequence $\lambda_k \xrightarrow{\alpha_i} r_i^{-1}\lambda_k \to \cdots \to \lambda_{k+1}$, which is obtained by combining $\lambda_k \xrightarrow{\alpha_i} r_i^{-1}\lambda_k$ with the $e_+^i(= a_k)$-chain for $(r_i^{-1}\lambda_k, \lambda_{k+1})$ as the result of applying e_i to π. From this observation, we see that $\mathrm{depth}_i^0(\lambda_k - \lambda_{k+1}) > 0$, and that there exists some $\beta_l = w\alpha_i$, with $1 \leq l \leq s-1$ and $w \in \mathcal{W}_{re}$. Hence it follows from Lemma 3.3.5 that $\beta_l = \alpha_i$ and $a_k\alpha_i^\vee(\lambda_k) = 1 - a_{ii}$. $\square$

Now, we define a crystal structure on $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$. Let $\pi \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda)$. We set $\mathrm{wt}(\pi) := \pi(1) \in \lambda - Q^+$. For each $i \in I^{re}$, we set $\varepsilon_i(\pi) := -m_i^\pi$, $\varphi_i(\pi) := \alpha_i^\vee\big(\mathrm{wt}(\pi)\big) - m_i^\pi = h_i^\pi(1) - m_i^\pi$. Then, we have $\varepsilon_i(\pi) = \max\{n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \mid e_i^n\pi \in \mathbb{P}\}$, and $\varphi_i(\pi) = \max\{n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \mid f_i^n\pi \in \mathbb{P}\}$. For each $i \in I^{im}$, we set $\varepsilon_i(\pi) := 0$, $\varphi_i(\pi) := \alpha_i^\vee\big(\mathrm{wt}(\pi)\big)$. By the definitions, we have $\varphi_i(\pi) = \varepsilon_i(\pi) + \alpha_i^\vee\big(\mathrm{wt}(\pi)\big)$ for all $i \in I$. Next, we define the Kashiwara operators. We use the root operators e_i, $i \in I^{re}$, and f_i, $i \in I$, on $\mathbb{P}$ as Kashiwara operators. For e_i, $i \in I^{im}$, we use the "cutoff" of the root operators e_i, $i \in I^{im}$, on $\mathbb{P}$ $\big(\supset \mathbb{B}(\lambda)\big)$, i.e., if $e_i\pi \notin \mathbb{B}(\lambda)$, then we set $e_i\pi := \mathbf{0}$ in $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ even if $e_i\pi \neq \mathbf{0}$ in

$\mathbb{P}$. Thus, $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ is endowed with a crystal structure. In particular, $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ is a *normal crystal* (for details, see [**JL**, §3.1.3]). Note that the crystal structure on $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ defined above agree with that in [**JL**]. Thus, we know the following from [**JL**].

Theorem 3.3.6 ([**JL**, Proposition 6.3.5]). *Let $\pi \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda)$. Then, $e_i\pi = \mathbf{0}$ in $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ for all $i \in I$ if and only if $\pi = \pi_\lambda := (\lambda; 0, 1)$. Moreover, we have $\mathbb{B}(\lambda) = \mathcal{F}\pi_\lambda \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$, where $\mathcal{F} := \langle f_i \mid i \in I \rangle_{\text{monoid}}$ is the monoid generated by the Kashiwara operators f_i for $i \in I$.*

For $\pi_1, \pi_2, \ldots, \pi_n \in \mathbb{P}$, define the *concatenation of paths* $\pi := \pi_1 \otimes \pi_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes \pi_n \in \mathbb{P}$ by the formula: $\pi(t) = \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} \pi_l(1) + \pi_k(nt - k + 1)$ for $\frac{k-1}{n} \leq t \leq \frac{k}{n}$ and $1 \leq k \leq n$. The following proposition follows immediately from the tensor product rule for crystals.

Proposition 3.3.7 (cf. [**Li1-2**]). *Let $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n \in P^+$. We set*

$$\mathbb{B}(\lambda_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{B}(\lambda_n) := \{\pi_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \pi_n \in \mathbb{P} \mid \pi_i \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda_i) \ (i = 1, \ldots, n)\},$$

and define a crystal structure on $\mathbb{B}(\lambda_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{B}(\lambda_n) \ \big(\subset \mathbb{P}\big)$ in the same way as $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ above by using the cutoff of the root operators $e_i, \ i \in I^{im}$. Then, the resulting crystal is isomorphic to the tensor product of the crystals $\mathbb{B}(\lambda_1), \ldots, \mathbb{B}(\lambda_n)$.

Let us show one important property of the operators $e_i, \ i \in I^{im}$, for later use. For this purpose, we need the following lemma, which is proved by the same argument as for [**JL**, Lemma 5.3.5].

Lemma 3.3.8 *Let $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{W}\lambda$ be such that $\mu \geq \nu$, and $\alpha_i \in \Pi_{im}$. If $\alpha_i^\vee(\mu) = \alpha_i^\vee(\nu)$, then $r_i^{-1}\mu \geq r_i^{-1}\nu$. Moreover, if there exists an a-chain for (μ, ν) for some rational number $a \in (0, 1]$, then there exists an a-chain for $\big(r_i^{-1}\mu, r_i^{-1}\nu\big)$.*

Note that the a-chain above for $(r_i^{-1}\mu, r_i^{-1}\nu)$ is not necessarily of shape λ.

Corollary 3.3.9 *Fix $i \in I^{im}$, and let $\pi = F f_i F' \pi_\lambda \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda)$, where $F, F' \in \mathcal{F}$, and $F = f_{i_1} f_{i_2} \cdots f_{i_k}$ with $f_{i_s} \neq f_i$ for $s = 1, 2, \ldots, k$. Then, the following are equivalent:*

(1) $e_i\pi \neq \mathbf{0}$ in $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$;

(2) $e_+^i(\pi) = f_-^i(F'\pi_\lambda)$;

(3) for each p, $1 \leq p \leq k$, either $\alpha_{i_p}^\vee(\alpha_i) = 0$, or

$$\Big[0, f_-^i\big(F'\pi_\lambda\big)\Big) \cap \Big(f_+^{i_p}\big(f_{i_{p+1}} \cdots f_{i_k} f_i F' \pi_\lambda\big), \ f_-^{i_p}\big(f_{i_{p+1}} \cdots f_{i_k} f_i F' \pi_\lambda\big)\Big) = \emptyset.$$

Proof. It is clear that (2) and (3) are equivalent, and that (1) implies (2). Hence it suffices to show that (2) and (3) imply (1).

From (2) and (3), we have $e_i\pi \in \mathbb{P}$. Now, we set $f_-^i := f_-^i(F'\pi_\lambda)$, $\pi = (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_p, \ldots, \lambda_k; a_0, \ldots, f_-^i = a_p, \ldots, a_k)$, and $e_i\pi = \bigl(r_i^{-1}\lambda_1, \ldots, r_i^{-1}\lambda_p,\ \lambda_{p+1}, \ldots, \lambda_k;\ a_0, \ldots, f_-^i = a_p, \ldots, a_k\bigr)$. Here, by (3), we have $\alpha_i^\vee(\lambda_1) = \cdots = \alpha_i^\vee(\lambda_p)$. Therefore, by Lemma 3.3.8, there exists an a_q-chain for $\bigl(r_i^{-1}\lambda_q, r_i^{-1}\lambda_{q+1}\bigr)$ for each $q = 1, 2, \ldots, p-1$. Hence it remains to show that there exists an a_p-chain for $(r_i^{-1}\lambda_p, \lambda_{p+1})$. If we show this, it follows that $e_i\pi \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda)$. Since $\mathrm{depth}_i^0(\lambda_p - \lambda_{p+1}) > 0$, there must be a positive root of the form $w\alpha_i$ for $w \in \mathcal{W}_{re}$ in the a_p-chain for $(\lambda_p, \lambda_{p+1})$. Also, we have $a_p\alpha_i^\vee(\lambda_p) = 1 - a_{ii}$ by (3). Consequently, by Lemma 3.3.5, there exists an a_p-chain for $(r_i^{-1}\lambda_p, \lambda_{p+1})$. □

4 Embedding of path models and a crystal isomorphism theorem.

In this section, we introduce our main tool, which we call an *embedding of path models*. It provides an embedding of Joseph–Lamprou's path model for a generalized Kac–Moody algebra into Littelmann's path model for a certain Kac–Moody algebra constructed from the Borcherds–Cartan datum of the given generalized Kac–Moody algebra. By using this embedding, we give a new proof of the isomorphism theorem for path crystals, obtained in [**JL**, §7.4].

4.1 Embedding of path models.

Let $\bigl(A = (a_{ij})_{i,j\in I}, \mathit{\Pi} = \{\alpha_i\}_{i\in I}, \mathit{\Pi}^\vee = \{\alpha_i^\vee\}_{i\in I}, P, P^\vee\bigr)$ be a Borcherds–Cartan datum. From this, we construct a new *Cartan datum*. We set $\tilde{I} := \bigl\{i^{(1)}\bigr\}_{i\in I^{re}} \sqcup \bigl\{i^{(n)}\bigr\}_{i\in I^{im}, n\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}}$, and define a Cartan matrix $B = \bigl(b_{i^{(n)},j^{(m)}}\bigr)_{i^{(n)},j^{(m)}\in\tilde{I}}$ by

$$\begin{cases} b_{i^{(n)},i^{(n)}} := 2 \text{ for } i^{(n)} \in \tilde{I}, \\ b_{i^{(n)},j^{(m)}} := a_{ij} \text{ for } i^{(n)}, j^{(m)} \in \tilde{I}, \text{ with } i^{(n)} \neq j^{(m)}. \end{cases}$$

Let us denote by $\bigl(B, \widetilde{\mathit{\Pi}} := \{\beta_{i^{(n)}}\}_{i^{(n)}\in\tilde{I}}, \widetilde{\mathit{\Pi}}^\vee := \{\beta_{i^{(n)}}^\vee\}_{i^{(n)}\in\tilde{I}}, \widetilde{P}, \widetilde{P}^\vee\bigr)$ the Cartan datum associated to B, where $\widetilde{\mathit{\Pi}}, \widetilde{\mathit{\Pi}}^\vee$ are the sets of simple roots and simple coroots, respectively, $\widetilde{P}$ is a weight lattice, and $\widetilde{P}^\vee$ is a coweight lattice. Let $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}} = \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}(B)$ be the associated Kac–Moody algebra, $\tilde{\mathfrak{h}} := \widetilde{P}^\vee \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{C}$ the Cartan subalgebra, and $\widetilde{W}$ the Weyl group. Note that the Coxeter group $\mathfrak{W}$ (in Definition 2.2.2) is not necessarily isomorphic to the Weyl group $\widetilde{W}$.

Lemma 4.1.1 *If A is symmetrizable, then so is B.*

Proof. Take a diagonal matrix $D = \mathrm{diag}(s_i)_{i \in I}$ such that DA is symmetric. It follows that $\beta^{\vee}_{i^{(n)}}\bigl(\beta_{j^{(m)}}\bigr)s_i = a_{ij}s_i = a_{ji}s_j = \beta^{\vee}_{j^{(m)}}\bigl(\beta_{i^{(n)}}\bigr)s_j$ for $i^{(n)}, j^{(m)} \in \tilde{I}$, with $i^{(n)} \neq j^{(m)}$. Hence, if we set $\tilde{s}_{i^{(n)}} := s_i$ and $\widetilde{D} := \mathrm{diag}(\tilde{s}_{i^{(n)}})_{i^{(n)} \in \tilde{I}}$, then $\widetilde{D}B$ is symmetric. Thus, B is symmetrizable. $\square$

For each $\mu \in \mathcal{W}P^+ = \mathcal{W}_{re}P^+$, we take (and fix) an element $\tilde{\mu} \in \widetilde{P}$ such that

$$\beta^{\vee}_{i^{(n)}}(\tilde{\mu}) = \alpha^{\vee}_i(\mu) \text{ for all } i^{(n)} \in \tilde{I}.$$

Let $\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}$ denote the set of all piecewise-linear continuous maps $\tilde{\pi} : [0,1] \longrightarrow (\tilde{\mathfrak{h}}_{\mathbb{R}})^*$ such that $\tilde{\pi}(0) = 0$, and $\widetilde{\mathbb{B}}(\tilde{\mu})$ the set of all (G)LS paths of shape $\tilde{\mu}$ for $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$. We set $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}} := \bigl\langle f_{i^{(m)}} \bigm| i^{(m)} \in \tilde{I} \bigr\rangle_{\mathrm{monoid}}$, $\Lambda := (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ $\bigl($resp., $\tilde{\Lambda} := (\tilde{\lambda}_1, \dots, \tilde{\lambda}_n)\bigr)$, and $\pi_{\Lambda} := \pi_{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n} := \pi_{\lambda_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \pi_{\lambda_n} \in \mathbb{P}$ $\bigl($resp., $\pi_{\tilde{\Lambda}} := \pi_{\tilde{\lambda}_1, \dots, \tilde{\lambda}_n} := \pi_{\tilde{\lambda}_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \pi_{\tilde{\lambda}_n} \in \widetilde{\mathbb{P}}\bigr)$. Following the notation of §2.2, we write $F_{\mathbf{i}} = f_{i_k} \cdots f_{i_2} f_{i_1} \in \mathcal{F}$ for $\mathbf{i} = (i_k, \dots, i_2, i_1) \in \mathcal{I}$, and $F_{\mathbf{i}^{(\mathbf{m})}} = f_{i_k^{(m_k)}} \cdots f_{i_2^{(m_2)}} f_{i_1^{(m_1)}} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$ for $\mathbf{i}^{(\mathbf{m})} = \bigl(i_k^{(m_k)}, \dots, i_2^{(m_2)}, i_1^{(m_1)}\bigr) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{I}}$.

Proposition 4.1.2 *The map* $\tilde{}$ *given below is well-defined and injective:*

$$\tilde{} : \mathcal{F}\pi_{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n} \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}\pi_{\tilde{\lambda}_1, \dots, \tilde{\lambda}_n}, \quad \pi := F_{\mathbf{i}}\pi_{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n} \longmapsto \tilde{\pi} := F_{\mathbf{i}^{(\mathbf{m})}}\pi_{\tilde{\lambda}_1, \dots, \tilde{\lambda}_n},$$

where the $\mathbf{m}$ *for which* $\mathbf{i}^{(\mathbf{m})} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{I}}_{\mathrm{ord}}$ *is determined uniquely by* $\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}$.

The map $\tilde{}$ in the proposition above is not necessarily a morphism of crystals. However, it is a *quasi-embedding* of crystals, that is, the equality $\widetilde{f_i\pi} = f_{i^{(m)}}\tilde{\pi}$ holds for $\pi \in \mathcal{F}\pi_{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n}$ if $i \in I^{re}$ and $m = 1$, or if $\pi = F_{\mathbf{i}}\pi_{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n} \in \mathcal{F}\pi_{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n}$, $i \in I^{im}$, and $m - 1$ is the number of appearances of i in $\mathbf{i}$.

Example 4.1.3 *Let* $A = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} 2 & -1 \\ \hline -2 & -4 \end{array}\right)$ *be a Borcherds–Cartan matrix, where* $I = \{1, 2\}$, $I^{re} = \{1\}$, *and* $I^{im} = \{2\}$. *We set* $\tilde{I} := \bigl\{1^{(1)}\bigr\} \sqcup \bigl\{2^{(1)}, 2^{(2)}, 2^{(3)}, 2^{(4)}, \dots\bigr\}$, *and define*

$$B := \left(\begin{array}{c|ccccc} 2 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & \cdots \\ \hline -2 & 2 & -4 & -4 & -4 & \cdots \\ -2 & -4 & 2 & -4 & -4 & \cdots \\ -2 & -4 & -4 & 2 & -4 & \cdots \\ -2 & -4 & -4 & -4 & 2 & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{array}\right).$$

Let $\pi = f_{\mathbf{2}}f_{\mathbf{2}}f_1f_{\mathbf{2}}f_{\mathbf{2}}f_{\mathbf{2}}f_1f_1f_{\mathbf{2}}f_{\mathbf{2}}\pi_{\lambda} \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ *be a GLS path of shape* λ. *Then the corresponding LS path* $\tilde{\pi}$ *of shape* $\tilde{\lambda}$ *is given as follows:*

$$\tilde{\pi} := f_{\mathbf{2}^{(\mathbf{7})}}f_{\mathbf{2}^{(\mathbf{6})}}f_{1^{(1)}}f_{\mathbf{2}^{(\mathbf{5})}}f_{\mathbf{2}^{(\mathbf{4})}}f_{\mathbf{2}^{(\mathbf{3})}}f_{1^{(1)}}f_{1^{(1)}}f_{\mathbf{2}^{(\mathbf{2})}}f_{\mathbf{2}^{(\mathbf{1})}}\pi_{\tilde{\lambda}} \in \widetilde{\mathbb{B}}(\tilde{\lambda}).$$

Proposition 4.1.2 is established by combining the following lemmas.

In what follows, we denote by $[\mu]$ the unique element in $\mathcal{W}_{re}\mu \cap P^+$ for $\mu \in \mathcal{W}P^+$.

Remark 4.1.4 *Note that* $\pi_\lambda \in \mathbb{B}\big([\lambda]\big)$ $\big($*resp.,* $\pi_{\tilde{\lambda}} \in \widetilde{\mathbb{B}}\big([\tilde{\lambda}]\big)\big)$ *for all* $\lambda \in \mathcal{W}P^+$. *It follows that for each* $\pi \in \mathcal{F}\pi_{\lambda_1,\dots,\lambda_n}$ $\big($*resp.,* $\tilde{\pi} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}\pi_{\tilde{\lambda}_1,\dots,\tilde{\lambda}_n}\big)$, *we have* $\pi \in \mathbb{B}\big([\lambda_1]\big)\otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{B}\big([\lambda_n]\big)$ $\big($*resp.,* $\tilde{\pi} \in \widetilde{\mathbb{B}}\big([\tilde{\lambda}_1]\big)\otimes \cdots \otimes \widetilde{\mathbb{B}}\big([\tilde{\lambda}_n]\big)\big)$. *Therefore, each of the tensor factors of these elements satisfies the chain condition (see Definition 3.2.2).*

Let $\mathbf{i} = (i_k, \dots, i_2, i_1) \in \mathcal{I}$. For each $r = 1, 2, \dots, k$, we set $\mathbf{i}_r := (i_r, \dots, i_2, i_1) \in \mathcal{I}$ and $\mathbf{i}_r^{(\mathbf{m})} := \big(i_r^{(m_r)}, \dots, i_2^{(m_2)}, i_1^{(m_1)}\big) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{I}}$. Let us take an element $\pi = F_{\mathbf{i}}\pi_\Lambda = F_{\mathbf{i}}\pi_{\lambda_1,\dots,\lambda_n} = f_{i_k} \cdots f_{i_2} f_{i_1} \pi_{\lambda_1,\dots,\lambda_n}$, and set $\tilde{\pi} := F_{\mathbf{i}^{(\mathbf{m})}}\pi_{\tilde{\Lambda}} = F_{\mathbf{i}^{(\mathbf{m})}}\pi_{\tilde{\lambda}_1,\dots,\tilde{\lambda}_n}$, where $\mathbf{i}^{(\mathbf{m})} = \big(i_k^{(m_k)}, \dots, i_2^{(m_2)}, i_1^{(m_1)}\big) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{I}}_{\mathrm{ord}}$.

Lemma 4.1.5 *If* $\pi \in \mathbb{P} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$, *then* $\tilde{\pi} \in \widetilde{\mathbb{P}} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$. *Moreover, we have* $h_{i_r}^{F_{\mathbf{i}_{r-1}}\pi_\Lambda}(t) = h_{i_r^{(m_r)}}^{F_{\mathbf{i}_{r-1}^{(\mathbf{m})}}\pi_{\tilde{\Lambda}}}(t)$ *for all* $r = 1, 2, \dots, k$, *and* $t \in [0, 1]$.

Proof. Note that for a path $\pi \in \mathbb{P} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$, it depends only on the values $h_i^\pi(1)$ and m_i^π whether $f_i\pi = \mathbf{0}$ or not. We proceed by induction on k, and show the two assertions of the lemma simultaneously. If $k = 0$, the assertion is clear. So, we assume that $k \geq 1$. Then we have $F_{\mathbf{i}_{k-1}}\pi_\Lambda \neq \mathbf{0}$, and hence, by our induction hypothesis, $F_{\mathbf{i}_{k-1}^{(\mathbf{m})}}\pi_{\tilde{\Lambda}} \neq \mathbf{0}$ and $h_{i_r}^{F_{\mathbf{i}_{r-1}}\pi_\Lambda}(t) = h_{i_r^{(m_r)}}^{F_{\mathbf{i}_{r-1}^{(\mathbf{m})}}\pi_{\tilde{\Lambda}}}(t)$ for all $r = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$, $t \in [0, 1]$. Therefore, there exist functions $\psi_r : [0, 1] \longrightarrow [0, 1]$ for $r = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$ such that $\big(F_{\mathbf{i}_{k-1}}\pi_\Lambda\big)(t) = \pi_\Lambda(t) - \sum_{r=1}^{k-1} \psi_r(t)\alpha_{i_r}$ and $\big(F_{\mathbf{i}_{k-1}^{(\mathbf{m})}}\pi_{\tilde{\Lambda}}\big)(t) = \pi_{\tilde{\Lambda}}(t) - \sum_{r=1}^{k-1} \psi_r(t)\beta_{i_r^{(m_r)}}$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$. Also, we have $\alpha_{i_k}^\vee(\lambda_s) = \beta_{i_k^{(m_k)}}^\vee\big(\tilde{\lambda}_s\big)$ for all $s = 1, \dots, n$, and $\alpha_{i_k}^\vee(\alpha_{i_r}) = \beta_{i_k^{(m_k)}}^\vee\big(\beta_{i_r^{(m_r)}}\big)$ for all $r = 1, \dots, k-1$. This implies that $h_{i_k}^{F_{\mathbf{i}_{k-1}}\pi_\Lambda}(t) = h_{i_k^{(m_k)}}^{F_{\mathbf{i}_{k-1}^{(\mathbf{m})}}\pi_{\tilde{\Lambda}}}(t)$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$. From this, we deduce that $F_{\mathbf{i}^{(\mathbf{m})}}\pi_{\tilde{\Lambda}} \neq \mathbf{0}$. $\square$

Corollary 4.1.6 *With the notation above,* $\pi \in \mathbb{P} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ *if and only if* $\tilde{\pi} \in \widetilde{\mathbb{P}} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$.

For $\mathbf{i} = (i_k, \dots, i_2, i_1) \in \mathcal{I}$, we set $\mathbf{i}(i) := (x_p, \dots, x_2, x_1)$ if $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_p\} = \{x \mid i_x = i,\ 1 \leq x \leq k\}$ and $1 \leq x_1 < x_2 < \cdots < x_p \leq k$.

Lemma 4.1.7 *Let* $\mathbf{i} := (i_k, \dots, i_2, i_1)$, $\mathbf{j} := (j_k, \dots, j_2, j_1) \in I^k$. *Suppose that* $F_{\mathbf{i}}\pi_\Lambda = F_{\mathbf{j}}\pi_\Lambda$ *in* $\mathcal{F}\pi_\Lambda$. *If* $\mathbf{i}(i) = (x_p, \dots, x_2, x_1)$ *and* $\mathbf{j}(i) = (y_p, \dots, y_2, y_1)$ *for* $i \in I^{im}$, *then we have* $f_\pm^i\big(F_{\mathbf{i}_{x_q-1}}\pi_\Lambda\big) = f_\pm^i\big(F_{\mathbf{j}_{y_q-1}}\pi_\Lambda\big)$ *for all* $1 \leq q \leq p$.

Proof. We set $f_\pm^{i_{x_q}} := f_\pm^i\big(F_{\mathbf{i}_{x_q-1}}\pi_\Lambda\big)$ and $f_\pm^{j_{y_q}} := f_\pm^i\big(F_{\mathbf{j}_{y_q-1}}\pi_\Lambda\big)$ for $1 \leq q \leq p$. Note that $\alpha_i \in \mathit{\Pi}_{im}$ is antidominant. Therefore, we have $f_\pm^{i_{x_p}} \leq \cdots \leq f_\pm^{i_{x_2}} \leq f_\pm^{i_{x_1}}$, and $f_\pm^{i_{y_p}} \leq \cdots \leq f_\pm^{i_{y_2}} \leq f_\pm^{i_{y_1}}$. Also, we have $\pi_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \pi_n = \pi_1' \otimes \cdots \otimes \pi_n'$ if and only if $\pi_1 = \pi_1', \dots, \pi_n = \pi_n'$. Hence we may assume that $n = 1$. In this case, Lemma 4.1.7 follows from Proposition 3.3.2. $\square$

Lemma 4.1.8 *If we write* $\pi_1 := F_{\mathbf{i}}\pi_\Lambda$ *and* $\pi_2 := F_{\mathbf{j}}\pi_\Lambda$, *then* $\pi_1 = \pi_2$ *if and only if* $\tilde{\pi}_1 = \tilde{\pi}_2$.

Proof. If $\pi_1 = \mathbf{0}$ or $\pi_2 = \mathbf{0}$, then the assertion follows from Corollary 4.1.6. So, we may assume that $\pi_1 \neq \mathbf{0}$ and $\pi_2 \neq \mathbf{0}$. Then, the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 4.1.5 shows that $\pi_1(t) = \pi_\Lambda(t) - \sum_{r=1}^{k} \psi_r^1(t)\alpha_{i_r}$, $\pi_2(t) = \pi_\Lambda(t) - \sum_{r=1}^{k} \psi_r^2(t)\alpha_{j_r}$, $\tilde{\pi}_1(t) = \pi_{\tilde{\Lambda}}(t) - \sum_{r=1}^{k} \psi_r^1(t)\beta_{i_r^{(m_r)}}$, and $\tilde{\pi}_2(t) = \pi_{\tilde{\Lambda}}(t) - \sum_{r=1}^{k} \psi_r^2(t)\beta_{j_r^{(l_r)}}$ for some functions $\psi_r^\epsilon : [0,1] \longrightarrow [0,1]$, $r = 1, \dots, k$ and $\epsilon = 1, 2$, where we denote by $\mathbf{i} = (i_k, \dots, i_1)$, $\mathbf{j} = (j_k, \dots, j_1) \in \mathcal{I}$, and by $\mathbf{i^{(m)}} = \big(i_k^{(m_k)}, \dots, i_1^{(m_1)}\big)$, $\mathbf{j^{(l)}} = \big(j_k^{(l_k)}, \dots, j_1^{(l_1)}\big) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{I}}_{\mathrm{ord}}$.

Suppose that $\pi_1 = \pi_2$. Then we have

$$\sum_{1 \le r \le k, i_r = i} \psi_r^1(t) = \sum_{1 \le r \le k, j_r = i} \psi_r^2(t).$$

Therefore, for $i \in I^{re}$, we see that

$$\sum_{\substack{1 \le r \le k \\ i_r^{(m_r)} = i^{(1)}}} \psi_r^1(t) = \sum_{\substack{1 \le r \le k \\ i_r = i}} \psi_r^1(t) = \sum_{\substack{1 \le r \le k \\ j_r = i}} \psi_r^2(t) = \sum_{\substack{1 \le r \le k \\ j_r^{(l_r)} = i^{(1)}}} \psi_r^2(t).$$

This implies that the coefficients of $\beta_{i^{(1)}}$ are equal for $\tilde{\pi}_1(t)$ and $\tilde{\pi}_2(t)$.

Next, let $i \in I^{im}$. If we write $\mathbf{i}(i) = \big(x_p, \dots, x_1\big)$ and $\mathbf{j}(i) = \big(y_p, \dots, y_1\big)$, then we have $\psi_{x_q}^1(t) = \psi_{y_q}^2(t)$ for each $1 \le q \le p$ by Proposition 3.3.2 and Lemma 4.1.7. Hence for each $1 \le q \le p$, the coefficients of $\beta_{i^{(q)}}$ are equal for $\tilde{\pi}_1(t)$ and $\tilde{\pi}_2(t)$. This shows the equality $\tilde{\pi}_1 = \tilde{\pi}_2$.

Conversely, suppose that $\tilde{\pi}_1 = \tilde{\pi}_2$. We can show the equality $\pi_1 = \pi_2$ in a way similar to the above. This proves the lemma. $\square$

4.2 An isomorphism theorem.

If $\pi_\Lambda = \pi_{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n}$ is a dominant path, i.e., $\pi_\Lambda(t) \in \sum_{\eta \in P^+} \mathbb{R}_{\ge 0}\eta$ for all $t \in [0,1]$, then $\pi_{\tilde{\Lambda}} = \pi_{\tilde{\lambda}_1, \dots, \tilde{\lambda}_n}$ is also a dominant path. In particular, it follows that $\lambda := \lambda_1 + \cdots + \lambda_n$ (resp., $\tilde{\lambda} := \tilde{\lambda}_1 + \cdots + \tilde{\lambda}_n$) is a dominant integral weight.

Theorem 4.2.1 (Isomorphism Theorem). *We have the following isomorphism of crystals:*

$$\mathbb{B}(\lambda) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{F}\pi_\Lambda, \ F\pi_\lambda \longmapsto F\pi_\Lambda \ (F \in \mathcal{F}).$$

Proof. Recall that $\mathbb{B}(\lambda) = \mathcal{F}\pi_\lambda$ and $\widetilde{\mathbb{B}}(\tilde{\lambda}) = \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}\pi_{\tilde{\lambda}}$. Hence, by Proposition 4.1.2, we have an embedding

$$\mathbb{B}(\lambda) \hookrightarrow \widetilde{\mathbb{B}}(\tilde{\lambda}), \ F_{\mathbf{i}}\pi_\lambda \mapsto F_{\mathbf{i^{(m)}}}\pi_{\tilde{\lambda}} \ \big(\mathbf{i^{(m)}} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{I}}_{\mathrm{ord}}\big).$$

Also, again by Proposition 4.1.2, we have an embedding

$$\mathcal{F}\pi_\Lambda \hookrightarrow \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}\pi_{\tilde{\Lambda}}, \ F_{\mathbf{i}}\pi_\Lambda \mapsto F_{\mathbf{i^{(m)}}}\pi_{\tilde{\Lambda}} \ \big(\mathbf{i^{(m)}} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{I}}_{\mathrm{ord}}\big).$$

Here, by the isomorphism theorem for path crystals for Kac–Moody algebras due to Littelmann ([**Li2**, Theorem 7.1]), we have the isomorphism of crystals

$$\widetilde{\mathbb{B}}(\tilde{\lambda}) \xrightarrow{\cong} \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}\pi_{\tilde{\Lambda}},\ F_{\mathbf{i}^{(\mathbf{m})}}\pi_{\tilde{\lambda}} \mapsto F_{\mathbf{i}^{(\mathbf{m})}}\pi_{\tilde{\Lambda}}\ \big(\mathbf{i}^{(\mathbf{m})} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{I}}\big).$$

By composing these maps, we obtain the desired isomorphism. □

5 A characterization of standard paths.

A path $\pi \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{B}(\lambda_n)$ is said to be *standard* if $\pi \in \mathcal{F}\pi_{\lambda_1,\dots,\lambda_n}$. In this section, we give a necessary and sufficient condition for a given path to be standard in terms of the monoid $\mathcal{W}$. This result can be regarded as a generalization of [**Li3**, Theorem 10.1] to the case of generalized Kac–Moody algebras.

5.1 The connecting condition.

We introduce a certain condition for a concatenation of GLS paths, which we call the *connecting condition*. Note that our condition below is similar to the one (the joining condition) introduced in [**JL**, §7.3.3], but is somewhat different.

Definition 5.1.1 *Let* $\pi_k := \big(\lambda_1^k, \lambda_2^k, \dots, \lambda_{i_k}^k;\ 0, a_1^k, \dots, a_{i_k-1}^k, 1\big) \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda_k)$ *for* $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$. *We say that the tuple* $(\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n)$ *satisfies the connecting condition if there exist* $w_j^k \in \mathcal{W}$ *for* $j = 1, 2, \dots, i_k$, $k = 2, 3, \dots, n-1$, *and* $(j,k) = (1,n)$ *such that*

(1) $w_j^k \lambda_k = \lambda_j^k$,

(2) $\lambda_{i_l}^l \ge w_1^{l+1}\lambda_l \ge w_2^{l+1}\lambda_l \ge \cdots \ge w_{i_{n-1}}^{n-1}\lambda_l \ge w_1^n \lambda_l$ *in* $\mathcal{W}\lambda_l$ *for each* $1 \le l \le n-1$,

(3) $w_1^{l+1}\lambda_l \in \mathcal{W}_{re}\lambda_l$ *for each* $1 \le l \le n-1$,

(4) there exists a 1*-chain for* $\big(\lambda_{i_l}^l, w_1^{l+1}\lambda_l\big)$ *for each* $1 \le l \le n-1$.

Note that $w_2^{l+1}\lambda_l, \dots, w_{i_{n-1}}^{n-1}\lambda_l, w_1^n\lambda_l$ belong to $\mathcal{W}_{re}\lambda_l$ for each $1 \le l \le n-1$. We set

$$\mathcal{C}_{\lambda_1,\dots,\lambda_n} := \big\{\pi_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \pi_n \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{B}(\lambda_n) \ \big|\ (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n) \text{ satisfies the connecting condition}\big\}.$$

The aim of this subsection is to prove the equality $\mathcal{C}_{\lambda_1,\dots,\lambda_n} = \mathcal{F}\pi_{\lambda_1,\dots,\lambda_n}$. For this purpose, we need to recall some fundamental properties of a-chains. For the proof of the following lemmas, we refer the reader to [**JL, Li1-2**].

Lemma 5.1.2 ([**JL**, **Li1-2**]). *Let* $a \in (0,1]$ *be a rational number,* $\lambda \in P^+$, $i \in I^{re}$, *and* $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{W}\lambda$ *with* $\mu > \nu$. *Then the following hold.*

(1) If $r_i\mu < \mu$ and $r_i\nu \geq \nu$, then $\mu \geq r_i\nu$ $(\geq \nu)$. Moreover, if there exists an a-chain for (μ, ν), then there also exists one for $(\mu, r_i\nu)$.

(2) If $r_i\mu < \mu$ and $r_i\nu \geq \nu$, then $(\mu >)$ $r_i\mu \geq \nu$. Moreover, if there exists an a-chain for (μ, ν), then there also exists one for $(r_i\mu, \nu)$.

(3) If $r_i\mu \leq \mu$ and $r_i\nu > \nu$, then $(\mu \geq)$ $r_i\mu \geq \nu$. Moreover, if there exists an a-chain for (μ, ν), then there also exists one for $(r_i\mu, \nu)$.

(4) If $r_i\mu \leq \mu$ and $r_i\nu > \nu$, then $\mu \geq r_i\nu$ $(> \nu)$. Moreover, if there exists an a-chain for (μ, ν), then there also exists one for $(\mu, r_i\nu)$.

(5) If $r_i\mu > \mu$ and $r_i\nu \geq \nu$, then $r_i\mu > r_i\nu$ $(\geq \nu)$. Moreover, if there exists an a-chain for (μ, ν), then there also exists one for $(r_i\mu, r_i\nu)$.

(6) If $r_i\mu \leq \mu$ and $r_i\nu < \nu$, then $(\mu \geq)$ $r_i\mu > r_i\nu$. Moreover, if there exists an a-chain for (μ, ν), then there also exists one for $(r_i\mu, r_i\nu)$.

Lemma 5.1.3 ([**JL**, Lemma 7.3.1]). *Let $\lambda, \mu \in P^+$, $w \in \mathcal{W}$, and $\beta \in \Delta_{re}^+ \sqcup \Delta_{im}$. If $\beta^\vee(w\lambda) > 0$, then $\beta^\vee(w\mu) \geq 0$.*

For $\pi_k = \left(\lambda_1^k, \lambda_2^k, \ldots, \lambda_{i_k}^k; 0, a_1^k, \ldots, a_{i_k-1}^k, 1\right) \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda_k)$, $1 \leq k \leq n$, we set $\pi := \pi_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \pi_n \in \mathcal{C}_{\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n}$. Also, we set $\mathfrak{I} := \left\{(m, j) \mid j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, i_m\},\ m \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}\right\}$, and equip the set $\mathfrak{I}$ with the lexicographic order.

Lemma 5.1.4 *Let $\pi \in \mathcal{C}_{\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n}$ and $i \in I$. If $f_i\pi \in \mathbb{P}$, then $f_i\pi \in \mathcal{C}_{\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n}$.*

Proof. If $f_i\pi \in \mathbb{P}$, then $f_i\pi = \pi_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \pi_{k-1} \otimes (f_i\pi_k) \otimes \pi_{k+1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \pi_n$ for some k, $1 \leq k \leq n$, by Proposition 3.3.7.

Case 1: $0 < f_+^i(\pi_k) < f_-^i(\pi_k) < 1$.

In this case, we necessarily have $i \in I^{re}$. Let us write $f_i\pi_k$ as $\left(\lambda_1^k, \ldots, \lambda_{p-1}^k, r_i\lambda_p^k, \ldots, r_i\lambda_q^k, \lambda_q^k, \ldots, \lambda_{i_k}^k\right)$. By conditions (2) and (3) in the connecting condition for π, we have $w_q^k\lambda_l \geq w_{q+1}^k\lambda_l \geq \cdots \geq w_{i_k}^k\lambda_l \geq w_1^{k+1}\lambda_l$ in $\mathcal{W}_{re}\lambda_l$ for each $1 \leq l < k$, and $\alpha_i^\vee(w_q^k\lambda_k) = \alpha_i^\vee(\lambda_q^k) > 0$ by the definition of root operators and the monotonicity of GLS paths (see Remark 3.2.3). Therefore, by Lemma 5.1.3, it follows that $\alpha_i^\vee(w_q^k\lambda_l) \geq 0$, and hence $r_iw_q^k\lambda_l \geq w_q^k\lambda_l$ for each $1 \leq l < k$. From this, we deduce that $r_iw_q^k\lambda_l \geq w_q^k\lambda_l \geq w_{q+1}^k\lambda_l \geq \cdots \geq w_{i_k}^k\lambda_l \geq w_1^{k+1}\lambda_l$ in $\mathcal{W}_{re}\lambda_l$ for each $1 \leq l < k$. Hence, for $(m, j) \geq (k, q)$ in $\mathfrak{I}$, we use w_j^m given in the connecting condition for π.

Now, observe that by Remark 3.2.3, we have $\alpha_i^\vee(w_j^k\lambda_k) = \alpha_i^\vee(\lambda_j^k) > 0$ for each $p \le j \le q$, and hence $\alpha_i^\vee(w_j^k\lambda_l) \ge 0$ for $p \le j \le q$ and $1 \le l < k$ by Lemma 5.1.3. Therefore, by Lemma 5.1.2 (4) and (5), it follows that $r_iw_p^k\lambda_l \ge r_iw_{p+1}^k\lambda_l \ge \cdots \ge r_iw_q^k\lambda_l$ in $\mathcal{W}_{re}\lambda_l$ for each $l,\ 1 \le l < k$.

We set

$$(m_0, j_0) := \max\bigl\{(m, j) \in \mathfrak{I} \bigm| (m, j) < (k, p) \text{ with } \alpha_i^\vee(w_j^m\lambda_l) < 0 \text{ for some } l,\ 1 \le l \le m\bigr\}.$$

If the set above is empty, then we have $\alpha_i^\vee(w_j^m\lambda_l) \ge 0$ for all $(m, j) < (k, p)$ in $\mathfrak{I}$ and $1 \le l \le m$. Therefore, by Lemma 5.1.2 (4), (5), and (6), it follows that $r_i\lambda_{i_l}^l \ge r_iw_1^{l+1}\lambda_l \ge \cdots \ge r_iw_p^k\lambda_l$ in $\mathcal{W}\lambda_l$ for each $1 \le l < k$. In particular, there exists a 1-chain for $\bigl(r_i\lambda_{i_l}^l, r_iw_1^{l+1}\lambda_l\bigr)$. Also, in this case, the function $h_i^\pi(t)$ is increasing in the interval $[a_{i_1-1}^1, f_+^i(\pi)]$. However, the function $h_i^\pi(t)$ attains its minimum at $f_+^i(\pi)$. From these, we deduce that it is constant in this interval. Therefore, we have $\alpha_i^\vee(w_j^m\lambda_m) = 0$ for all (m, j), $(1, i_1) \le (m, j) < (k, p)$ in $\mathfrak{I}$, and hence $r_iw_j^m\lambda_m = w_j^m\lambda_m$. Thus, the connecting condition for $f_i\pi$ is satisfied by replacing w_j^m with $r_iw_j^m$ for each $(k, p) \le (m, j) \le (k, q)$.

Suppose that the set above is nonempty. Note that for $1 \le l < m_0$, we have $r_iw_{j_0+1}^{m_0}\lambda_l \ge \cdots \ge r_iw_p^k\lambda_l$ in $\mathcal{W}_{re}\lambda_l$, and $w_{j_0}^{m_0}\lambda_l \ge r_iw_{j_0+1}^{m_0}\lambda_l$ by Lemma 5.1.2 (1) and (4). Hence it follows that $\lambda_{i_l}^l \ge w_1^{l+1}\lambda_l \ge \cdots \ge w_{j_0}^{m_0}\lambda_l \ge r_iw_{j_0+1}^{m_0}\lambda_l \ge \cdots \ge r_iw_p^k\lambda_l$ in $\mathcal{W}\lambda_l$. Also, for $m_0 \le l < k$, we have $r_i\lambda_{i_l}^l \ge r_iw_1^{l+1}\lambda_l \ge \cdots \ge r_iw_p^k\lambda_l$ in $\mathcal{W}\lambda_l$. In particular, if $(m_0, j_0) = (l, i_l)$, then there exists a 1-chain for $\bigl(\lambda_{i_l}^l, r_iw_1^{l+1}\lambda_l\bigr)$ by Lemma 5.1.2 (1) and (4). Therefore, the same argument as above shows that $r_iw_j^m\lambda_m = w_j^m\lambda_m$ if $(m_0, j_0) < (m, j) < (k, p)$ in $\mathfrak{I}$. Thus, if we replace each w_j^m with $r_iw_j^m$ for $(m_0, j_0) < (m, j) < (k, q)$, then the connecting condition for $f_i\pi$ is satisfied.

Case 2: $f_+^i(\pi_k) = 0$.

If $i \in I^{re}$, then the assertion is shown in the same way as in Case 1. So, we assume that $i \in I^{im}$. By condition (2) in the connecting condition for π, we have $\lambda_{i_l}^l \ge w_1^{l+1}\lambda_l \ge w_2^{l+1}\lambda_l \ge \cdots \ge w_1^n\lambda_l$ in $\mathcal{W}\lambda_l$. Since $\alpha_i^\vee(\lambda_{i_l}^l) = 0$, we have $0 = \alpha_i^\vee(\lambda_{i_l}^l) \ge \alpha_i^\vee(w_1^{l+1}\lambda_l) \ge \cdots \ge \alpha_i^\vee(w_1^n\lambda_l) \ge 0$, which implies that these are all equal to 0, and hence the elements $w_1^{l+1}\lambda_l, w_2^{l+1}\lambda_l, \ldots, w_1^n\lambda_l$ are fixed by r_i. In particular, $r_iw_1^{l+1}\lambda_l = w_1^{l+1}\lambda_l$ belongs to $\mathcal{W}_{re}\lambda_l$. Thus, by replacing the (given) elements w_j^k with $r_iw_j^k$ for each $1 \le j \le q$, the connecting condition for $f_i\pi$ is satisfied.

Case 3: $f_-^i(\pi_k) = 1$.

If we verify the existence of a 1-chain for $\bigl(r_i\lambda_{i_k}^k, w_1^{k+1}\lambda_k\bigr)$, then we can show that the connecting condition for $f_i\pi$ is satisfied in the same way as in Cases 1 and 2. Since $f_-^i(\pi_k) = 1$, it follows that $\alpha_i^\vee(\lambda_{i_k}^k) > 0$, and that $r_i\lambda_{i_k}^k \xrightarrow{\alpha_i} \lambda_{i_k}^k$ is a 1-chain. Therefore, we can combine a 1-chain for $\bigl(\lambda_{i_k}^k, w_1^{k+1}\lambda_k\bigr)$ given in the connecting condition for π with $r_i\lambda_{i_k}^k \xrightarrow{\alpha_i} \lambda_{i_k}^k$ to obtain a desired one.

□

The proof of the following lemma is similar to that of Lemma 5.1.4.

Lemma 5.1.5 *Let* $\pi \in \mathcal{C}_{\lambda_1,\dots,\lambda_n}$ *and* $i \in I^{re}$. *If* $e_i\pi \in \mathbb{P}$, *then* $e_i\pi \in \mathcal{C}_{\lambda_1,\dots,\lambda_n}$.

Lemma 5.1.6 *Let* $\pi \in \mathcal{C}_{\lambda_1,\dots,\lambda_n}$ *and* $i \in I$. *If* $f_i\pi$ *(resp.,* $e_i\pi$*)* $\in \mathbb{B}(\lambda_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{B}(\lambda_n)$, *then* $f_i\pi$ *(resp.,* $e_i\pi$*)* $\in \mathcal{C}_{\lambda_1,\dots,\lambda_n}$.

Proof. Note that $\mathbb{B}(\lambda_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{B}(\lambda_n)$ is closed in $\mathbb{P}$ by $e_i, i \in I^{re}$, and $f_i, i \in I$, i.e., if $e_i\pi \in \mathbb{P}$ for $i \in I^{re}$ (resp., $f_i\pi \in \mathbb{P}$ for $i \in I$), then $e_i\pi$ (resp., $f_i\pi$) $\in \mathbb{B}(\lambda_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{B}(\lambda_n)$ for $\pi \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{B}(\lambda_n)$. From this, the assertion for $e_i, i \in I^{re}$, and $f_i, i \in I$, follows. Hence it suffices to show the assertion for $e_i,\ i \in I^{im}$.

Let $i \in I^{im}$. By Propositions 3.3.4 and 3.3.7, we can write $e_i\pi = \pi_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \pi_{k-1} \otimes (e_i\pi_k) \otimes \pi_{k+1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \pi_n \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{B}(\lambda_n)$, where $e_i\pi_k = \big(r_i^{-1}w_1^k\lambda_k, \dots, r_i^{-1}w_p^k\lambda_k, w_{p+1}^k\lambda_k, \dots, w_{i_k}^k\lambda_k\big)$. We will show that $e_i\pi$ satisfies the connecting condition.

First, by conditions (2) and (3) in the connecting condition for π, we have $\lambda_{i_l}^l \geq w_1^{l+1}\lambda_l \geq w_2^{l+1}\lambda_l \geq \cdots\cdots \geq w_1^n\lambda_l$ in $\mathcal{W}\lambda_l$ for each $1 \leq l < k$. Since $\alpha_i^\vee(\lambda_{i_l}^l) = 0$, we have $0 = \alpha_i^\vee(\lambda_{i_l}^l) \geq \alpha_i^\vee(w_1^{l+1}\lambda_l) \geq \cdots\cdots \geq \alpha_i^\vee(w_1^n\lambda_l) \geq 0$ for each $1 \leq l < k$, which implies that these are all equal to 0, and hence $r_i^{-1}w_j^k\lambda_l = w_j^k\lambda_l$ for all $1 \leq j \leq p$. In particular, we have $r_i^{-1}w_1^k\lambda_{k-1} = w_1^k\lambda_{k-1} \in \mathcal{W}_{re}\lambda_{k-1}$.

If $e_+^i(\pi_k) < 1$, then the assertion is shown by replacing the (given) elements $w_j^k,\ j = 1, 2, \dots, p$, with the corresponding elements $r_i^{-1}w_j^k,\ j = 1, 2, \dots, p$. Hence we assume that $e_+^i(\pi_k) = 1$. We must verify the existence of a 1-chain for $\big(r_i^{-1}\lambda_{i_k}^k, w_1^{k+1}\lambda_k\big)$. By Proposition 3.3.4, we have $\alpha_i^\vee(\lambda_{i_k}^k) = 1 - a_{ii}$. Since $e_i\pi_k \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda_k)$, it follows that $r_i^{-1}\lambda_{i_k}^k \in \lambda_k - Q^+$, and hence $\mathrm{depth}_i^{\lambda_k}(\lambda_{i_k}^k) > 0$. Also, by condition (3) in the connecting condition, we have $w_1^{k+1}\lambda_k \in \mathcal{W}_{re}\lambda_k \subset \lambda_k - \sum_{j \in I^{re}} \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\alpha_j$. Therefore, $\lambda_{i_k}^k \neq w_1^{k+1}\lambda_k$, and there exists a positive root of the form $w\alpha_i$ for $w \in \mathcal{W}_{re}$ in the 1-chain for $\big(\lambda_{i_k}^k w_1^{k+1}\lambda_k\big)$, given by condition (4) in the connecting condition for π. Consequently, by Lemma 3.3.5, there exists a 1-chain for $\big(r_i^{-1}\lambda_{i_k}^k, w_1^{k+1}\lambda_k\big)$. Thus, in this case, if we replace the elements $w_j^k,\ j = 1, 2, \dots, i_k$, which are given by the connecting condition for π, with the elements $r_i^{-1}w_j^k,\ j = 1, 2, \dots, i_k$, then $e_i\pi$ satisfies connecting condition. □

Let $\pi \in \mathbb{P}$ and $\lambda \in P$. We say that π is λ-dominant if $\pi + \lambda$ is a dominant path, where $(\pi + \lambda)(t) := \pi(t) + \lambda$ is a path in $\mathfrak{h}_\mathbb{R}^*$.

Lemma 5.1.7 *Let* $\pi = \pi_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \pi_n \in \mathcal{C}_{\lambda_1,\dots,\lambda_n}$. *If* $e_i\pi = \mathbf{0}$ *in* $\mathbb{B}(\lambda_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{B}(\lambda_n)$ *for all* $i \in I$, *then* $\pi_k = \pi_{\lambda_k}$ *for all* $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$.

Proof. First we show that $\pi_1 = \pi_{\lambda_1}$. Let $i \in I^{re}$. If $e_i\pi = \pi_1 \otimes e_i(\pi_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes \pi_n)$, then $e_i\pi$ is not $\mathbf{0}$ since $\mathbb{B}(\lambda_1)\otimes\cdots\otimes\mathbb{B}(\lambda_n)$ is a normal crystal. Therefore, we must have $e_i\pi = (e_i\pi_1)\otimes\pi_2\otimes\cdots\otimes\pi_n$. In particular, it follows that

$$\varphi_i(\pi_1) \geq \varepsilon_i(\pi_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes \pi_n). \tag{A}$$

This implies that $e_i\pi_1 = \mathbf{0}$ in $\mathbb{B}(\lambda_1)$. Let $i \in I^{im}$. If $\alpha_i^\vee\big(\mathrm{wt}(\pi_1)\big) \geq 1 - a_{ii}$, then $e_i\pi = (e_i\pi_1) \otimes \pi_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes \pi_n$ by the tensor product rule for crystals. Therefore, we must have $e_i\pi_1 = \mathbf{0}$. If $\alpha_i^\vee\big(\mathrm{wt}(\pi_1)\big) < 1 - a_{ii}$, then $e_i\pi_1 = \mathbf{0}$ by the definiton of e_i. Hence we have $e_i\pi_1 = \mathbf{0}$ in $\mathbb{B}(\lambda_1)$. Consequently, we deduce from Theorem 3.3.6 that $\pi_1 = \pi_{\lambda_1}$. Moreover, by inequality (A), it follows that $h_j^{\pi_2\otimes\cdots\otimes\pi_n}(t) + \alpha_j^\vee(\lambda_1) \geq m_j^{\pi_2\otimes\cdots\otimes\pi_n} + \alpha_j^\vee(\lambda_1) = -\varepsilon_j(\pi_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes \pi_n) + \varphi_j(\pi_{\lambda_1}) \geq 0$ for all $j \in I^{re}$. Thus, $\pi_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes \pi_n$ is λ_1-dominant.

Now, we assume that $\pi = \pi_{\lambda_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \pi_{\lambda_{k-1}} \otimes \pi_k \otimes \cdots \otimes \pi_n$, and that $\pi_k \otimes \cdots \otimes \pi_n$ is $(\lambda_1 + \cdots + \lambda_{k-1})$-dominant. We proceed by induction on k, and show that $\pi_k = \pi_{\lambda_k}$ and $\pi_{k+1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \pi_n$ is $(\lambda_1 + \cdots + \lambda_k)$-dominant. We set $J := \big\{ j \in I \bigm| \alpha_j^\vee(\lambda_1 + \cdots + \lambda_{k-1}) = 0 \big\}$. By condition (2) in the connecting condition for π, we have $\lambda_l \geq w_1^k\lambda_l$ for each $1 \leq l \leq k-1$. Since λ_l is the minimum element of $\mathcal{W}\lambda_l$ in the partial order defined in §3.2, we have $\lambda_l = w_1^k\lambda_l$ for each $1 \leq l \leq k-1$. In particular, it follows that $w_1^k \in \mathrm{Stab}_{\mathcal{W}}(\lambda_1 + \cdots + \lambda_{k-1}) = \big\langle r_j \bigm| j \in J \big\rangle_{\mathrm{monoid}}$ by Lemma 2.2.9.

Case 1: $i \in J$.

If $i \in I^{re}$, then we have $h_i^{\pi_k\otimes\cdots\otimes\pi_n}(t) = h_i^{\pi_k\otimes\cdots\otimes\pi_n}(t) + \alpha_i^\vee(\lambda_1 + \cdots + \lambda_{k-1}) \geq 0$ for all $t \in [0,1]$ by the induction hypothesis. In particular, we have $h_i^{\pi_k}(t) = h_i^{\pi_k\otimes\cdots\otimes\pi_n}\big(\frac{t}{n-k+1}\big) \geq 0$ for all $t \in [0,1]$, and hence $e_i\pi_k = \mathbf{0}$ in $\mathbb{B}(\lambda_k)$.

If $i \in I^{im}$, then we have $\mathbf{0} = e_i(\pi_{\lambda_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \pi_{\lambda_{k-1}} \otimes \pi_k \otimes \cdots \otimes \pi_n) = \pi_{\lambda_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \pi_{\lambda_{k-1}} \otimes e_i(\pi_k \otimes \cdots \otimes \pi_n)$. Therefore, $e_i(\pi_k \otimes \cdots \otimes \pi_n) = \mathbf{0}$, and hence $e_i\pi_k = \mathbf{0}$ in $\mathbb{B}(\lambda_k)$.

Case 2: $i \notin J$.

In this case, $\lambda_1^k = w_1^k\lambda_k \in \lambda_k - \sum_{j\in J}\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\alpha_j$. Since $\lambda_1^k > \lambda_2^k > \cdots > \lambda_{i_k}^k$ in $\mathcal{W}\lambda_k$ and $\lambda_1^k \prec \lambda_2^k \prec \cdots \prec \lambda_{i_k}^k$, we have $\lambda_1^k, \lambda_2^k, \ldots, \lambda_{i_k}^k \in \lambda_k - \sum_{j\in J}\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\alpha_j$. This implies that $\mathrm{wt}(\pi_k) \in \lambda_k - \sum_{j\in J}\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\alpha_j$. Also, we have $\mathrm{wt}(\pi_k) + \alpha_i \notin \lambda_k - Q^+$ since $i \notin J$. Therefore, it follows that $e_i\pi_k = \mathbf{0}$ in $\mathbb{B}(\lambda_k)$. Consequently, we have $\pi_k = \pi_{\lambda_k}$, and $e_j(\pi_{\lambda_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \pi_{\lambda_k} \otimes \pi_{k+1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \pi_n) = e_j(\pi_{\lambda_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \pi_{\lambda_k}) \otimes (\pi_{k+1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \pi_n)$ for each $j \in I^{re}$ by the normality of $\mathbb{B}(\lambda_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{B}(\lambda_n)$. In particular, $\varphi_j(\pi_{\lambda_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \pi_{\lambda_k}) \geq \varepsilon_j(\pi_{k+1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \pi_n)$ for all $j \in I^{re}$. From this, we deduce that $h_j^{\pi_{k+1}\otimes\cdots\otimes\pi_n}(t) + \alpha_j^\vee(\lambda_1 + \cdots + \lambda_k) \geq m_j^{\pi_{k+1}\otimes\cdots\otimes\pi_n} + \alpha_j^\vee(\lambda_1 + \cdots + \lambda_k) = -\varepsilon_j(\pi_{k+1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \pi_n) + \varphi_j(\pi_{\lambda_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \pi_{\lambda_k}) \geq 0$ for all $t \in [0,1]$, which means that $\pi_{k+1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \pi_n$ is $(\lambda_1 + \cdots + \lambda_k)$-dominant.

□

Corollary 5.1.8 *Let $\lambda, \mu \in P^+$, and $\pi_1 \otimes \pi_2 \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda) \otimes \mathbb{B}(\mu)$. If $e_i(\pi_1 \otimes \pi_2) = \mathbf{0}$ in $\mathbb{B}(\lambda) \otimes \mathbb{B}(\mu)$ for all $i \in I$, then $\pi_1 = \pi_\lambda$, and π_2 is λ-dominant.*

By combining the lemmas above, we finally obtain the following.

Proposition 5.1.9 *The equality $\mathcal{C}_{\lambda_1,\dots,\lambda_n} = \mathcal{F}\pi_{\lambda_1,\dots,\lambda_n}$ holds.*

5.2 A characterization of standard paths in terms of $\mathcal{W}$.

In this subsection, we give a condition for standardness in terms of the Bruhat order on $\mathcal{W}$. It can be regarded as a generalization of [**Li3**, Theorem 10.1] to the case of generalized Kac–Moody algebras. Before doing this, we remark that the monoid $\mathcal{W}$ has the *Lifting Property*; the proof is similar to that of [**Hu**, Proposition in §5.9].

Lemma 5.2.1 (cf. [**Hu**, Proposition in §5.9]). *Let $w', w \in \mathcal{W}$, with $w' \leq w$, and let $i \in I^{re}$. Then, either $r_i w' \leq w$ or $r_i w' \leq r_i w$ holds.*

Theorem 5.2.2 *Let $\pi = \pi_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \pi_n \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{B}(\lambda_n)$, where $\pi_k = (\lambda_1^k, \lambda_2^k, \dots, \lambda_{i_k}^k; 0, a_1^k, \dots, a_{i_k-1}^k, 1) \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda_k)$ for each $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Then, π is standard if and only if there exist $w_j^k \in \mathcal{W}$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, i_k$ and $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$ such that*

(1) $w_j^k \lambda_k = \lambda_j^k$,

(2) $w_1^1 \geq \cdots \geq w_{i_1}^1 \geq w_1^2 \geq \cdots \geq w_{i_2}^2 \geq \cdots\cdots \geq w_{i_{n-1}}^{n-1} \geq w_1^n \geq \cdots \geq w_{i_n}^n$ *in* $\mathcal{W}$,

(3) $w_1^{l+1}\lambda_l \in \mathcal{W}_{re}\lambda_l$, *and there exists a* 1*-chain for* $\left(\lambda_{i_l}^l, w_1^{l+1}\lambda_l\right)$ *for* $l = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$.

We call the tuple $(w_1^1, w_2^1, \dots, w_{i_1}^1, w_1^2, \dots\dots, w_{i_{n-1}}^{i-1}, w_1^n, w_2^n, \dots, w_{i_n}^n)$ in this theorem a *defining chain* for π. Note that condition (3) above is automatically satisfied in the case of ordinary Kac–Moody algebras.

Proof of Theorem 5.2.2.

Observe that the natural surjection $\mathcal{W} \to \mathcal{W}\lambda$ respects the Bruhat order on $\mathcal{W}$ and the partial order on $\mathcal{W}\lambda$ defined in §3.2. Hence the condition above is clearly sufficient for standardness by Proposition 5.1.9. So, we will prove that the condition above is also necessary for standardness. Note that it suffices to show that the condition above is preserved by f_i, $i \in I$, since the tuple $(1, \dots, 1)$ is a defining chain for $\pi_{\lambda_1,\dots,\lambda_n}$.

We assume that $f_i\pi = \pi_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \pi_{k-1} \otimes (f_i\pi_k) \otimes \pi_{k+1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \pi_n$ for some k, and denote by $\mathbf{t}_q^l$ the tuple $(r_{\beta_1}, \dots, r_{\beta_s})$ consisting of the reflections for the positive roots appearing in a fixed chain for (w_q^l, w_{q+1}^l): $w_q^l \xleftarrow{\beta_1} \cdots \xleftarrow{\beta_s} w_{q+1}^l$ (in $\mathcal{W}$). Also, we denote by $\tilde{\mathbf{t}}_l$ a similar tuple

$(r_{\gamma_1}, \dots, r_{\gamma_t})$ corresponding to a fixed 1-chain for $\bigl(w^l_{i_l}\lambda_l, w^{l+1}_1\lambda_l\bigr)$: $w^l_{i_l}\lambda_l \xrightarrow{\gamma_1} \cdots \xrightarrow{\gamma_t} w^{l+1}_1\lambda_l$ (in $\mathcal{W}\lambda_l$).

Case 1: $i \in I^{im}$.

Suppose that $f_i\pi_k = \underbrace{r_i\lambda^k_1}_{=r_iw^k_1\lambda_k} \otimes \cdots \otimes \underbrace{r_i\lambda^k_p}_{=r_iw^k_p\lambda_k} \otimes \lambda^k_p \otimes \cdots \otimes \lambda^k_{i_k}$. Here we have $\alpha^\vee_i(w^k_1\lambda_k) = \cdots = \alpha^\vee_i(w^k_p\lambda_k) > 0$ by Proposition 3.3.2. Since $\alpha^\vee_i(w^l_q\lambda_l) = 0$ for all $(l,q) < (k,1)$ in $\mathfrak{I}$, r_i commutes with the reflections in $\mathbf{t}^l_q$ for $(l,q) < (k,p)$. Also, we have $w^l_{i_l}\lambda_l \geq w^{l+1}_1\lambda_l$ for each $1 \leq l < k$. This implies that $0 = \alpha^\vee_i(w^l_{i_l}\lambda_l) \geq \alpha^\vee_i(w^{l+1}_1\lambda_l) \geq 0$, and hence $\alpha^\vee_i(w^l_{i_l}\lambda_l) = \alpha^\vee_i(w^{l+1}_1\lambda_l) = 0$ for each $1 \leq l < k$. Moreover, r_i commutes with the reflections in $\tilde{\mathbf{t}}_l$, and $r_iw^{l+1}_1\lambda_l = w^{l+1}_1\lambda_l \in \mathcal{W}_{re}\lambda_l$. Therefore, there exists a 1-chain for $\bigl(r_iw^l_{i_l}\lambda_l, r_iw^{l+1}_1\lambda_l\bigr) = \bigl(w^l_{i_l}\lambda_l, w^{l+1}_1\lambda_l\bigr)$ by condition (3) above. Combining these, we obtain a desired defining chain for $f_i\pi$, which is constructed as follows: $\bigl(\mathbf{t}^1_1, \mathbf{t}^1_2, \dots, \mathbf{t}^k_{p-1}, \{r_i\} \cup \mathbf{t}^k_p, \mathbf{t}^k_{p+1}, \dots, \mathbf{t}^n_{i_n-1}\bigr)$, where we set $\{r_i\} \cup \mathbf{t}^k_p := \bigl(r_i, r_{\beta_1}, \dots, r_{\beta_s}\bigr)$ for $\mathbf{t}^k_p = (r_{\beta_1}, \dots, r_{\beta_s})$.

Case 2: $i \in I^{re}$.

Suppose that $f_i\pi_k = \bigl(\lambda^k_1, \dots, \lambda^k_{p-1}, r_i\lambda^k_p, \dots, r_i\lambda^k_q, \lambda^k_q, \dots, \lambda^k_{i_k}\bigr)$. Here, by Remark 3.2.3, we have $\alpha^\vee_i(\lambda^k_s) > 0$ for each $p \leq s \leq q$, and hence $w^k_s \xrightarrow{\alpha_i} r_iw^k_s$, $r_iw^k_s \geq r_iw^k_{s+1}$ for each $p \leq s \leq q-1$ by Lemma 5.2.1. Now, we set

$$(m_0, j_0) := \max\bigl\{(m,j) \in \mathfrak{I} \bigm| (m,j) < (k,p),\ w^m_j \xleftarrow{\alpha_i} r_iw^m_j\bigr\}.$$

Note that

$$\text{if } (m_0, j_0) < (m,j) < (k,p) \text{ in } \mathfrak{I}, \text{ then } w^m_j \xrightarrow{\alpha_i} r_iw^m_j. \tag{B}$$

$\bigl($If the set above is empty, then $w^m_j \xrightarrow{\alpha_i} r_iw^m_j$ for all $(m,j) < (k,p)$ in $\mathfrak{I}$.$\bigr)$ Therefore, by Lemma 5.2.1 again, we have $r_iw^m_j \geq r_iw^m_{j+1}$ $\bigl($and $r_iw^m_{i_m} \geq r_iw^{m+1}_1\bigr)$ for all (m,j), $(m_0,j_0) < (m,j) < (k,p)$ in $\mathfrak{I}$, and $w^m_j \xrightarrow{\alpha_i} r_iw^m_j$ since $\alpha^\vee_i(w^m_j\lambda_m) \geq 0$. Hence it follows that the function $h^\pi_i(t)$ is increasing in $[a^{m_0}_{j_0}, f^i_-(\pi) = a^k_{p-1}]$. However, the function $h^\pi_i(t)$ attains its minimum at $t = f^i_-(\pi)$. Thus, it must be constant in this interval. Namely, we have

$$\alpha^\vee_i(w^m_j\lambda_m) = 0 \text{ for all } (m,j),\ (m_0,j_0) < (m,j) < (k,p) \text{ in } \mathfrak{I}. \tag{C}$$

This implies that $r_iw^m_j$ is also a lift of λ^m_j. In addition, we have $w^{m_0}_{j_0} > w^{m_0}_{j_0+1}$, $w^{m_0}_{j_0} \xleftarrow{\alpha_i} r_iw^{m_0}_{j_0}$ and $w^{m_0}_{j_0+1} \xrightarrow{\alpha_i} r_iw^{m_0}_{j_0+1}$ in $\mathcal{W}$. Consequently, we deduce from Lemma 5.2.1 that $r_iw^{m_0}_{j_0+1} \leq w^{m_0}_{j_0}$.

Next, we verify the existence of a 1-chain. By condition (3) above, there exists a 1-chain for $\bigl(w^m_{i_m}\lambda_m, w^{m+1}_1\lambda_m\bigr)$, and $w^{m+1}_1\lambda_m \in \mathcal{W}_{re}\lambda_m$ for each $m_0 < m < k$. Therefore, we have $r_iw^{m+1}_1\lambda_m \in$

$\mathcal{W}_{re}\lambda_m$ and $w_1^{m+1} \xrightarrow{\alpha_i} r_i w_1^{m+1}$ by (B) above. This implies that $r_i w_1^{m+1}\lambda_m \geq w_1^{m+1}\lambda_m$ in $\mathcal{W}\lambda_m$. Also, we have $r_i w_{i_m}^m \lambda_m = w_{i_m}^m \lambda_m$ by (C) above. Now, by using Lemma 5.1.2 (4), we can verify, by case-by-case calculations, that there exists a 1-chain for $\big(r_i w_{i_m}^m \lambda_m = w_{i_m}^m \lambda_m, r_i w_1^{m+1}\lambda_m\big)$.

Finally, if $j_0 = i_{m_0}$ for the (m_0, j_0), then $w_{j_0}^{m_0}\lambda_{m_0} \geq r_i w_{j_0}^{m_0}\lambda_{m_0}$ since $w_{j_0}^{m_0} \xleftarrow{\alpha_i} r_i w_{j_0}^{m_0}$, and $w_1^{m_0+1}\lambda_{m_0} \leq r_i w_1^{m_0+1}\lambda_{m_0} \in \mathcal{W}_{re}\lambda_{m_0}$ since $w_1^{m_0+1} \xrightarrow{\alpha_i} r_i w_1^{m_0+1}$. Now, by using Lemma 5.1.2 (1) and (4), we can verify, by case-by-case calculations, that there exists a 1-chain for $\big(w_{j_0}^{m_0}\lambda_{m_0}, r_i w_1^{m_0+1}\lambda_{m_0}\big)$. □

6 Crystal isomorphism between $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ and $B(\lambda)$.

6.1 Proof of the isomorphism $\mathbb{B}(\lambda) \cong B(\lambda)$.

Let $B(\lambda)$ denote the crystal basis of the integrable highest weight $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module $V(\lambda)$ with highest weight $\lambda \in P^+$ (see [**JKK**]). In [**JL**], Joseph–Lamprou defined the map

$$\psi_{\lambda,\lambda+\mu} : \mathbb{B}(\lambda) \longrightarrow \mathbb{B}(\lambda) \otimes \mathbb{B}(\mu), \ \pi \longmapsto \pi \otimes \pi_\mu,$$

for all $\lambda, \mu \in P^+$. We have $\pi \otimes \pi_\mu \in \mathcal{F}(\pi_\lambda \otimes \pi_\mu)$ by Theorem 5.2.2, and $\mathcal{F}(\pi_\lambda \otimes \pi_\mu) \cong \mathbb{B}(\lambda+\mu)$ by Theorem 4.2.1. Therefore, the map $\psi_{\lambda,\lambda+\mu}$ induces an embedding $\mathbb{B}(\lambda) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{B}(\lambda+\mu)$, which is a morphism of crystals, except for weights. Thus, if we write $\lambda \geq \mu$ when $\lambda - \mu \in P^+$ for $\lambda, \mu \in P^+$, then $\big\{\mathbb{B}(\lambda)\ (\lambda \in P^+);\ \psi_{\mu,\nu}\ (\mu,\nu \in P^+)\big\}$ forms an inductive system. It follows that the inductive limit $\mathbb{B}(\infty) := \varinjlim \mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ is naturally endowed with a crystal structure. In fact, Joseph–Lamprou ([**JL**, §8]) proved that $\mathbb{B}(\infty)$ is isomorphic to the crystal basis $B(\infty)$ of the negative part $U_q^-(\mathfrak{g})$ of the quantized universal enveloping algebra $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ (for the precise statement, see [**JKK**, **JKKS**, **JL**]). By the definition of $\mathbb{B}(\infty)$ above, there exists a unique embedding $\Psi_\lambda : \mathbb{B}(\lambda) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{B}(\infty) \otimes \mathcal{T}_\lambda$ of crystals for each $\lambda \in P^+$. Also, we can verify that the map $\mathbb{B}(\lambda) \to \mathbb{B}(\infty) \otimes \mathcal{T}_\lambda \otimes C$, $\pi \mapsto \Psi_\lambda(\pi) \otimes c$, induces an isomorphism $\mathbb{B}(\lambda) \overset{\cong}{\to} \mathcal{F}(\pi_\infty \otimes t_\lambda \otimes c)$ of crystals, where π_∞ is the highest weight element of $\mathbb{B}(\infty)$, and $\mathcal{T}_\lambda := \{t_\lambda\}$, $C := \{c\}$ are crystals introduced in [**JKKS**]. Here we recall from [**JKKS**, §5] that $B(\lambda) \cong \mathcal{F}(b_\infty \otimes t_\lambda \otimes c) \subset B(\infty) \otimes \mathcal{T}_\lambda \otimes C$ as crystals. Thus, we have proved the following theorem.

Theorem 6.1.1 *For $\lambda \in P^+$, we have an isomorphism of crystals $\mathbb{B}(\lambda) \cong B(\lambda)$.*

As a consequence, we obtain the following embedding by Proposition 4.1.2:

$$B(\lambda) \hookrightarrow \widetilde{B}(\tilde{\lambda}),$$

where $\widetilde{B}(\tilde{\lambda})$ is the crystal basis of the integrable highest weight $U_q(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$-module $\widetilde{V}(\tilde{\lambda})$ with highest weight $\tilde{\lambda} \in \widetilde{P}^+$. This embedding is not a morphism of crystals. However, it is a quasi-embedding of crystals in the sense of §4.1.

7 Decomposition rules for crystals of GLS paths.

7.1 Decomposition Rule for tensor products.

Lemma 7.1.1 *Let $\lambda, \mu \in P^+$, and let $\pi \in \mathbb{B}(\mu)$ be a λ-dominant path. Then, $e_i(\pi_\lambda \otimes \pi) = \mathbf{0}$ for all $i \in I^{im}$ if and only if $\tilde{\pi} \in \widetilde{\mathbb{B}}(\tilde{\mu})$ is $\tilde{\lambda}$-dominant.*

Proof. In the following, we write $m(\pi, i)$ instead of m_i^π. For $\mathbf{i} = (i_k, \dots, i_2, i_1) \in \mathcal{I}$, we set $\pi := F_{\mathbf{i}}\pi_\mu$ and $\tilde{\pi} = F_{\mathbf{i}^{(\mathbf{m})}}\pi_{\tilde{\mu}}$. Since π is λ-dominant, we have $h_{i^{(1)}}^{\pi_{\tilde{\lambda}} \otimes \tilde{\pi}}(t) = h_i^{\pi_\lambda \otimes \pi}(t) \geq 0$ for all $i \in I^{re}$. Also, if $i^{(m)}$ is not in $\mathbf{i}^{(\mathbf{m})}$, then it is clear that $h_{i^{(m)}}^{\pi_{\tilde{\lambda}} \otimes \tilde{\pi}}(t) \geq 0$.

Let us take $i \in I^{im}$ appearing in $\mathbf{i}$. If $\mathbf{i}(i) = (x_p, \dots, x_2, x_1)$, then it follows that $m\big(\tilde{\pi}, i_{x_q}^{(m_{x_q})}\big) \geq m\big(F_{\mathbf{i}_{x_q}^{(\mathbf{m})}}\pi_{\tilde{\mu}}, i_{x_q}^{(m_{x_q})}\big) = -1$ for each $q = 1, 2, \dots, p$, where $\mathbf{i}_r^{(\mathbf{m})} = \big(i_r^{(m_r)}, \dots, i_2^{(m_2)}, i_1^{(m_1)}\big)$ for $r = 1, 2, \dots k$ as in §4.1. If $\alpha_i^\vee(\lambda) > 0$, then $e_i(\pi_\lambda \otimes \pi) = (e_i\pi_\lambda) \otimes \pi = \mathbf{0} \otimes \pi = \mathbf{0}$. Also, since $\beta^\vee_{i_{x_q}^{(m_q)}}(\tilde{\lambda}) = \alpha_i^\vee(\lambda) > 0$, we have $\beta^\vee_{i_{x_q}^{(m_q)}}(\tilde{\lambda}) + m\big(\tilde{\pi}, i_{x_q}^{(m_{x_q})}\big) \geq 0$ for each $q = 1, 2, \dots, p$.

If $\alpha_i^\vee(\lambda) = 0$, then $\beta^\vee_{i_{x_q}^{(m_q)}}(\tilde{\lambda}) = 0$ for each $q = 1, 2, \dots, l$, and $e_i(\pi_\lambda \otimes \pi) = \pi_\lambda \otimes (e_i\pi)$. Hence we have $e_i(\pi_\lambda \otimes \pi) = \mathbf{0}$ if and only if $e_i\pi = \mathbf{0}$. Now, we set $f_\pm^{i_r} := f_\pm^{i_r}(F_{\mathbf{i}_{r-1}}\pi_\mu)$ and $f_\pm^{i_r^{(m_r)}} := f_\pm^{i_r^{(m_r)}}(F_{\mathbf{i}_{r-1}^{(\mathbf{m})}}\pi_{\tilde{\mu}})$ for each $r = 1, 2, \dots, k$. By Corollary 3.3.9, we have $e_i\pi = \mathbf{0}$ if and only if there exists i_r, with $x_p < r \leq k$, such that $\alpha_{i_r}^\vee(\alpha_{i_{x_p}}) \neq 0$ and $[0, f_-^{i_{x_p}}) \cap \big(f_+^{i_r}, f_-^{i_r}\big) \neq \emptyset$. Since $f_-^{i_{x_p}} \leq f_-^{i_{x_{p-1}}} \leq \dots \leq f_-^{i_{x_1}}$, this is equivalent to $[0, f_-^{i_{x_q}}) \cap \big(f_+^{i_r}, f_-^{i_r}\big) \neq \emptyset$ for all $q = 1, \dots, p$. Furthermore, by using the embedding of Proposition 4.1.2, we infer that there exists $i_r^{(m_r)}$, with $x_p < r \leq k$, such that $\beta^\vee_{i_r^{(m_r)}}\big(\beta_{i_{x_q}^{(m_{x_q})}}\big) \neq 0$ and $\big[0, f_-^{i_{x_q}^{(m_{x_q})}}\big) \cap \big(f_+^{i_r^{(m_r)}}, f_-^{i_r^{(m_r)}}\big) \neq \emptyset$ for all $q = 1, \dots, p$. Since the $i_{x_q}^{(m_{x_q})}$, $q = 1, \dots, p$, are all distinct, these conditions are equivalent to $m\big(\tilde{\pi}, i_{x_q}^{(m_{x_q})}\big) > m\big(F_{\mathbf{i}_{x_q}^{(\mathbf{m})}}\pi_{\tilde{\mu}}, i_{x_q}^{(m_{x_q})}\big)$ for all $q = 1, 2, \dots, p$. In this case, we have $m\big(F_{\mathbf{i}_{x_q}^{(\mathbf{m})}}\pi_{\tilde{\mu}}, i_{x_q}^{(m_{x_q})}\big) = -1$, $m\big(\tilde{\pi}, i_{x_q}^{(m_{x_q})}\big) \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\beta^\vee_{i_{x_q}^{(m_{x_q})}}(\tilde{\lambda}) = 0$ for all $q = 1, \dots, p$, and hence $\beta^\vee_{i_{x_q}^{(m_{x_q})}}(\tilde{\lambda}) + m\big(\tilde{\pi}, i_{x_q}^{(m_{x_q})}\big) \geq 0$ for all $q = 1, \dots, p$. This proves the lemma. □

By Corollary 5.1.8, we can restate this lemma as follows:

Proposition 7.1.2 *Let $\pi_1 \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ and $\pi_2 \in \mathbb{B}(\mu)$. Then, $e_i(\pi_1 \otimes \pi_2) = \mathbf{0}$ in $\mathbb{B}(\lambda) \otimes \mathbb{B}(\mu)$ for all $i \in I$ if and only if $\pi_1 = \pi_\lambda$, and $\tilde{\pi}_2$ is $\tilde{\lambda}$-dominant in $\widetilde{\mathbb{B}}(\tilde{\mu})$.*

From this proposition, by using Theorem 6.1.1, we obtain the following decomposition rule.

Theorem 7.1.3 *Let $\lambda, \mu \in P^+$. Then, we have an isomorphism of crystals:*

$$\mathbb{B}(\lambda) \otimes \mathbb{B}(\mu) \;\cong\; \bigsqcup_{\substack{\pi \in \mathbb{B}(\mu) \\ \tilde{\pi}\,:\,\tilde{\lambda}\text{-dominant}}} \mathbb{B}\big(\lambda + \pi(1)\big).$$

7.2 Branching Rule for restriction to Levi subalgebras.

Let $S \subset I$ be a subset. We set $S^{re} := S \cap I^{re}$ and $S^{im} := S \cap I^{im}$. Also, we set $\widetilde{S} := \{i^{(1)}\}_{i \in S^{re}} \sqcup \{i^{(n)}\}_{i \in S^{im}, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}}$. Let us denote by $\mathfrak{g}_S$ (resp., $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{\widetilde{S}}$) the Levi subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ corresponding to S (resp., the Levi subalgebra of $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ corresponding to $\widetilde{S}$). We say that a path π is $\mathfrak{g}_S$-dominant (resp., $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{\widetilde{S}}$-dominant) if π is a dominant path for $\mathfrak{g}_S$ (resp., $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{\widetilde{S}}$).

Lemma 7.2.1 *Let $\pi \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda)$. Then, $e_i\pi = \mathbf{0}$ in $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ for all $i \in S$ if and only if $\tilde{\pi} \in \widetilde{\mathbb{B}}(\tilde{\lambda})$ is $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{\widetilde{S}}$-dominant.*

Proof. We write $m(\pi, i)$ instead of m_i^{π} as in the proof of Lemma 7.1.1. For $\mathbf{i} := (i_k, \dots, i_2, i_1) \in \mathcal{I}$, we set $\pi = F_{\mathbf{i}}\pi_\lambda$ and $\tilde{\pi} = F_{\mathbf{i}^{(\mathbf{m})}}\pi_{\tilde{\lambda}}$. If $i \in S^{re}$, then $e_i\pi = \mathbf{0}$ if and only if $h_i^{\pi}(t) \geq 0$ for all $t \in [0,1]$, which is equivalent to $h_{i^{(1)}}^{\tilde{\pi}}(t) \geq 0$ for all $t \in [0,1]$. Note that $h_{i^{(n)}}^{\tilde{\pi}}(t) \geq 0$ for those $i^{(n)}$ which do not appear in $\mathbf{i}^{(\mathbf{m})}$. Also, if $i \notin S^{im}$ or if i does not appear in $\mathbf{i}$, then $e_i\pi = \mathbf{0}$ and $h_{i^{(n)}}^{\tilde{\pi}}(t) \geq 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$.

Now, let us take $i \in S^{im}$ appearing in $\mathbf{i}$. If $\mathbf{i}(i) = (x_p, \dots, x_2, x_1)$, then it follows that $m\big(\tilde{\pi}, i_{x_q}^{(m_{x_q})}\big) \geq m\big(F_{\mathbf{i}_{x_q}^{(\mathbf{m})}}\pi_{\tilde{\lambda}}, i_{x_q}^{(m_{x_q})}\big) = -1$ for each $q = 1, 2, \dots, p$. We will use the argument in the proof of Lemma 7.1.1. By Corollary 3.3.9, $e_i\pi = \mathbf{0}$ if and only if there exists i_r, with $x_p < r \leq k$, such that $\alpha_{i_r}^{\vee}(\alpha_{i_{x_p}}) \neq 0$ and $[0, f_-^{i_{x_p}}) \cap \big(f_+^{i_r}, f_-^{i_r}\big) \neq \emptyset$. Since $f_-^{i_{x_p}} \leq f_-^{i_{x_{p-1}}} \leq \cdots \leq f_-^{i_{x_1}}$, the last condition is equivalent to $[0, f_-^{i_{x_q}}) \cap \big(f_+^{i_r}, f_-^{i_r}\big) \neq \emptyset$ for all $q = 1, \dots, p$. Furthermore, by using the embedding of Proposition 4.1.2, we infer that there exists $i_r^{(m_r)}$, with $x_p < r \leq k$, such that $\beta_{i_r^{(m_r)}}^{\vee}\big(\beta_{i_{x_q}^{(m_{x_q})}}\big) \neq 0$ and $\big[0, f_-^{i_{x_q}^{(m_{x_q})}}\big) \cap \big(f_+^{i_r^{(m_r)}}, f_-^{i_r^{(m_r)}}\big) \neq \emptyset$ for all $q = 1, \dots, p$. Since the $i_{x_q}^{(m_{x_q})}$, $q = 1, \dots, p$, are all distinct, these conditions are equivalent to $m\big(\tilde{\pi}, i_{x_q}^{(m_{x_q})}\big) > m\big(F_{\mathbf{i}_{x_q}^{(\mathbf{m})}}\pi_{\tilde{\lambda}}, i_{x_q}^{(m_{x_q})}\big)$ for all $q = 1, 2, \dots, p$. In this case, we have $m\big(F_{\mathbf{i}_{x_q}^{(\mathbf{m})}}\pi_{\tilde{\lambda}}, i_{x_q}^{(m_{x_q})}\big) = -1$, $m\big(\tilde{\pi}, i_{x_q}^{(m_{x_q})}\big) \in \mathbb{Z}$ for all $q = 1, \dots, p$, and hence $m\big(\tilde{\pi}, i_{x_q}^{(m_{x_q})}\big) \geq 0$ for all $q = 1, \dots, p$. This proves the lemma. □

Let us denote by $\mathbb{B}_S(\lambda)$ the set of GLS paths of shape λ for $\mathfrak{g}_S$.

Theorem 7.2.2 *Let $\lambda \in P^+$. Then, we have an isomorphism of $\mathfrak{g}_S$-crystals:*

$$\mathbb{B}(\lambda) \cong \bigsqcup_{\substack{\pi \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda) \\ \tilde{\pi} : \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{\widetilde{S}}\text{-dominant}}} \mathbb{B}_S\big(\pi(1)\big).$$

8 Appendix.

In this appendix, we give the (postponed) proofs of results stated in §2.2.

Proof of Lemma 2.2.3.

It is clear that the map σ is well-defined. To prove that it is bijective, we will construct its inverse. Now we define

$$\xi : \mathfrak{W} \longrightarrow \mathcal{W}, \ r_{\mathbf{i}^{(\mathbf{m})}} \longmapsto r_{\mathbf{i}},$$

where $\mathbf{i}^{(\mathbf{m})} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{I}}_{\mathrm{ord}}$. If ξ is well-defined, then it clearly provides the inverse of σ.

To verify the well-definedness of ξ, we define the free group $\widetilde{\mathfrak{W}}$ generated by the symbols $\tilde{r}_{i^{(n)}}, \ i^{(n)} \in \tilde{I}$, and then a map

$$\tilde{\xi} : \widetilde{\mathfrak{W}} \longrightarrow \mathcal{W}, \ \tilde{r}_{\mathbf{i}^{(\mathbf{m})}} \longmapsto r_{\mathbf{i}},$$

where $\tilde{r}_{\mathbf{i}^{(\mathbf{m})}} := \tilde{r}_{i_k^{(m_k)}} \cdots \tilde{r}_{i_2^{(m_2)}} \tilde{r}_{i_1^{(m_1)}} \in \widetilde{\mathfrak{W}}$ if $\mathbf{i} = (i_k, \ldots, i_2, i_1)$ and $\mathbf{m} = (m_k, \ldots, m_2, m_1)$. Obviously, $\tilde{\xi}$ is well-defined. Moreover, if $\tilde{r}_{\mathbf{i}^{(\mathbf{m})}}$ is such that

$$m_s \neq m_t \text{ for } i_s = i_t \in I^{im}, \text{ with } s \neq t, \tag{1}$$

then $\tilde{\xi}$ commutes with *nil-moves* and *braid-moves* for $\tilde{r}_{\mathbf{i}^{(\mathbf{m})}}$, that is, if $\tilde{r}_{\mathbf{i}^{(\mathbf{m})}} = \tilde{v}\tilde{r}_{i^{(n)}}\tilde{r}_{i^{(n)}}\tilde{u}$, then

$$\tilde{\xi}\big(\tilde{v}\tilde{r}_{i^{(n)}}\tilde{r}_{i^{(n)}}\tilde{u}\big) = \tilde{\xi}\big(\tilde{v}\tilde{u}\big),$$

and if $\tilde{r}_{\mathbf{i}^{(\mathbf{m})}} = \tilde{v}\,\underbrace{\tilde{r}_{i^{(n)}}\tilde{r}_{j^{(m)}}\tilde{r}_{i^{(n)}} \cdots}_{l \text{ letters}}\,\tilde{u}$ with $x_{i^{(n)}j^{(m)}} = l$, then

$$\tilde{\xi}\Big(\tilde{v}\,\underbrace{\tilde{r}_{i^{(n)}}\tilde{r}_{j^{(m)}}\tilde{r}_{i^{(n)}} \cdots}_{l \text{ letters}}\,\tilde{u}\Big) = \tilde{\xi}\Big(\tilde{v}\,\underbrace{\tilde{r}_{j^{(m)}}\tilde{r}_{i^{(n)}}\tilde{r}_{j^{(m)}} \cdots}_{l \text{ letters}}\,\tilde{u}\Big).$$

Note that if $\tilde{r}_{\mathbf{i}^{(\mathbf{m})}}$ satisfies condition (1), then the number of appearances of $r_{i^{(m)}}$, with $i \in I^{im}$, in the word for $r_{\mathbf{i}^{(\mathbf{m})}}$ is constant for each $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ during the process of nil-moves and braid-moves. In particular, it is at most one. Hence condition (1) is preserved by nil-moves and braid-moves.

Now, let $r_{\mathbf{i}^{(\mathbf{m})}} = r_{\mathbf{j}^{(\mathbf{n})}}$ be two expressions of a given element in $\mathfrak{W}$, with $\mathbf{i}^{(\mathbf{m})}, \ \mathbf{j}^{(\mathbf{n})} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{I}}_{\mathrm{ord}}$. If we take $\tilde{r}_{\mathbf{i}^{(\mathbf{m})}}, \ \tilde{r}_{\mathbf{j}^{(\mathbf{n})}} \in \widetilde{\mathfrak{W}}$, then these elements satisfy condition (1), and $\xi(r_{\mathbf{i}^{(\mathbf{m})}}) = \tilde{\xi}\big(\tilde{r}_{\mathbf{i}^{(\mathbf{m})}}\big), \ \xi(r_{\mathbf{j}^{(\mathbf{n})}}) = \tilde{\xi}\big(\tilde{r}_{\mathbf{j}^{(\mathbf{n})}}\big)$ by the definitions. Also, by the *Word Property* (see [**BB**, Theorem 3.3.1]) of the Coxeter group $\mathfrak{W}$, every given expression can be transformed into a reduced expression by repeated application of nil-moves and braid-moves. Now, we lift these moves for $r_{\mathbf{i}^{(\mathbf{m})}}$ and $r_{\mathbf{j}^{(\mathbf{n})}}$ to $\widetilde{\mathfrak{W}}$ as follows: $\tilde{r}_{\mathbf{i}^{(\mathbf{m})}} =: \tilde{v}_0 \to \tilde{v}_1 \to \cdots \to \tilde{v}_p, \ \tilde{r}_{\mathbf{j}^{(\mathbf{n})}} =: \tilde{u}_0 \to \tilde{u}_1 \to \cdots \to \tilde{u}_q$, where $\tilde{v}_p$ and $\tilde{u}_q$ are the corresponding reduced words, respectively. Then, from the arguments above, we deduce that $\tilde{\xi}\big(\tilde{r}_{\mathbf{i}^{(\mathbf{m})}}\big) = \tilde{\xi}\big(\tilde{v}_0\big) = \tilde{\xi}\big(\tilde{v}_1\big) = \cdots = \tilde{\xi}\big(\tilde{v}_p\big)$ and $\tilde{\xi}\big(\tilde{r}_{\mathbf{j}^{(\mathbf{n})}}\big) = \tilde{\xi}\big(\tilde{u}_0\big) = \tilde{\xi}\big(\tilde{u}_1\big) = \cdots = \tilde{\xi}\big(\tilde{u}_q\big)$. Again, by the Word Property, $\tilde{v}_p$ and $\tilde{u}_q$ are transformed into each other by repeated application of braid-moves only. Therefore, the same argument as above yields $\tilde{\xi}\big(\tilde{v}_p\big) = \tilde{\xi}\big(\tilde{u}_q\big)$. Thus, we have $\tilde{\xi}\big(\tilde{r}_{\mathbf{i}^{(\mathbf{m})}}\big) = \tilde{\xi}\big(\tilde{r}_{\mathbf{j}^{(\mathbf{n})}}\big)$, and hence $\xi(r_{\mathbf{i}^{(\mathbf{m})}}) = \xi(r_{\mathbf{j}^{(\mathbf{n})}})$. This proves the lemma. □

Corollary 2.2.5 is clear by Lemma 2.2.3. We give the proof of Corollary 2.2.6. Let $\big\{\gamma_{i^{(n)}} \bigm| i^{(n)} \in \tilde{I}\big\}$ be the set of simple roots associated with the Coxeter group $\mathfrak{W}$.

Proof of Corollary 2.2.6.

Let $v = r_{i_k} \cdots r_{i_1}$ and $v' = r_{j_l} \cdots r_{j_1}$. The condition $v = r_\beta v' = w r_i w^{-1} r_{j_l} \cdots r_{j_1}$ implies that $\#\{s \mid 1 \leq s \leq l,\ j_s = i\} = p - 1$. Therefore, we have $\sigma(v) = \sigma(r_\beta v') = \sigma(w) r_{i^{(p)}} \sigma(w^{-1}) \sigma(v') = r_{\sigma(w)(\gamma_{i^{(p)}})} \sigma(v')$. Also, we have $\ell\bigl(r_{\sigma(w)(\gamma_{i^{(p)}})}\sigma(v)\bigr) = \ell\bigl(\sigma(v')\bigr) = \ell(v') < \ell(v) = \ell\bigl(\sigma(v)\bigr)$, and hence

$$r_{\sigma(w)(\gamma_{i^{(p)}})}\sigma(v) = r_{i_k^{(m_k)}} \cdots \widehat{r_{i_s^{(m_s)}}} \cdots r_{i_1^{(m_1)}} \tag{2}$$

for some $i_s^{(m_s)} \in \tilde{I}$ by the Strong Exchange Property of $\mathfrak{W}$. In particular, $r_{i^{(p)}}$ appears at most once on the right-hand side of (2). However, we have $r_{\sigma(w)(\gamma_{i^{(p)}})}\sigma(v) = \sigma(v') \in \mathfrak{V}$, and $r_{i^{(p)}}$ does not appear in the expression $\sigma(v') = r_{j_l^{(n_l)}} \cdots r_{j_1^{(n_1)}}$. Consequently, by the Word Property of $\mathfrak{W}$, $r_{i^{(p)}}$ does not appear on the right-hand side of (2). From this, we deduce that $r_{i_s^{(m_s)}} = r_{i^{(p)}}$. Thus, the expression of an element on the right-hand side of (2) satisfies the condition for $\mathfrak{V}$. By applying σ^{-1} to both sides of (2), we obtain $v' = \sigma^{-1}\bigl(r_{\sigma(w)(\gamma_{i^{(p)}})}\sigma(v)\bigr) = r_{i_k} \cdots \widehat{r_{i_{x_p}}} \cdots r_{i_1}$. $\square$

Proof of Lemma 2.2.9.

The inclusion $\supset$ is clear. Hence we show the opposite inclusion $\subset$. Take $w \in \mathrm{Stab}_{\mathcal{W}}(\lambda)$ with dominant reduced expression $w = w_0 r_{i_1} w_1 \cdots r_{i_k} w_k$, where $i_1, \ldots, i_k \in I^{im}$, and $w_0, \ldots, w_k \in \mathcal{W}_{re}$. We proceed by induction on k. If $k = 0$, it is clear by a (well-known) property of ordinary Coxeter groups. Hence we assume that $k \geq 1$. In this case, $\mu := r_{i_1} w_1 \cdots r_{i_k} w_k \lambda$ is dominant, and $w_0 \mu = \lambda \in P^+$, which implies that $\mu = \lambda$ and $w_0 \in \langle r_i \mid \alpha_i^\vee(\lambda) = 0 \rangle$. Thus, we may assume that $w_0 = 1$. Note that $\alpha_{i_s}^\vee(w_s r_{i_{s+1}} w_{s+1} \cdots r_{i_k} w_k \lambda) \geq 0$ for all $s = 1, 2, \ldots, k$. Here, by the assumption that $w\lambda = \lambda$ and the linear independence of the simple roots, all of these inequalities must be equalities. In particular, we have $\alpha_{i_1}^\vee(w_1 r_{i_2} w_2 \cdots r_{i_k} w_k \lambda) = 0$. Consequently, we deduce that $\lambda = w\lambda = r_{i_1} w_1 \cdots r_{i_k} w_k \lambda = w_1 \cdots r_{i_k} w_k \lambda$. Now, by induction, the desired inclusion is shown. $\square$

References

[**BB**] A. Björner and F. Brenti, Combinatorics of Coxeter Groups, Grad. Texts in Math., vol. **231**, Springer, New York, 2005.

[**Bo1**] R. E. Borcherds, Generalized Kac–Moody algebras, J. Algebra **115** (1988), 501-512.

[**Bo2**] R. E. Borcherds, Monstrous moonshine and monstrous Lie superalgebras, Invent. Math. **109** (1992), 405-444.

[**CN**] J. H. Conway and S. Norton, Monstrous moonshine. Bull. Lond. Math. Soc. **11** (1979), 308-339.

[**D**] V. G. Drinfel'd, Hopf algebra and the quantum Yang–Baxter equation, Soviet Math. Dokl. **32** (1985), 254-258.

[**HK**] J. Hong and S.-J. Kang, Introduction to Quantum Groups and Crystal Bases, Grad. Studies in Math. vol. **42**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2002.

[**Hu**] J. E. Humphreys, Reflection Groups and Coxeter Groups, Camb. Stud. in Adv. Math., **29**, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1990.

[**JKK**] K. Jeong, S.-J. Kang, and M. Kashiwara, Crystal bases for quantum generalized Kac–Moody algebras, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. **90** (2005), 395-438.

[**JKKS**] K. Jeong, S.-J. Kang, M. Kashiwara, and D.-U. Shin, Abstract crystals for quantum generalized Kac–Moody algebras, Int. Math. Res. Not., 2007 Art. ID rnm001, 19 pages.

[**Ji**] M. Jimbo, A q-difference analogue of $U(\mathfrak{g})$ and the Yang–Baxter equation, Lett. Math. Phys. **10** (1985), 63-69.

[**Jo**] A. Joseph, Quantum Groups and Their Primitive Ideals, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete 3 Folge, vol. **29**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1995.

[**JL**] A. Joseph and P. Lamprou, A Littelmann path model for crystals of generalized Kac–Moody algebras, Adv. Math. **221** (2009), 2019-2058.

[**Kac**] V. G. Kac, Infinite Dimensional Lie Algebras, 3rd ed., Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1990.

[**Kan**] S.-J. Kang, Quantum deformations of generalized Kac–Moody algebras and their modules, J. Algebra **175** (1995), 1041-1066.

[**Kas1**] M. Kashiwara, Crystalizing the q-analogue of universal enveloping algebras, Commun. Math. Phys. **133** (1990), 249-260.

[**Kas2**] M. Kashiwara, On crystal bases of the q-analogue of universal enveloping algebras, Duke Math. J. **63** (1991), 465-509.

[**Kas3**] M. Kashiwara, The crystal base and Littelmann's refined Demazure character formula, Duke Math. J. **71** (1993), 839-858.

[**Kas4**] M. Kashiwara, On crystal bases, Representations of Groups (Banff, AB, 1994) (B. N. Allison and G. H. Cliff, eds.), CMS Conf. Proc., vol. **16**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1995, 155-197.

[**Kas5**] M. Kashiwara, Similarity of crystal bases, Lie Algebras and Their Representations (Seoul, 1995) (S.-J. Kang, M.-H. Kim, and I. Lee, eds), Contemp. Math., vol. **194**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, (1996), 177-186.

[**Li1**] P. Littelmann, A Littlewood–Richardson rule for symmetrizable Kac–Moody algebras, Inv. Math. **116** (1994), 329-346.

[**Li2**] P. Littelmann, Paths and root operators in representation theory, Ann. of Math. **124** (1995), 499-525.

[**Li3**] P. Littelmann, A plactic algebra for semisimple Lie algebras, Adv. Math. **124** (1996) 312-331.

[**Lu**] G. Lusztig, Canonical bases arising from quantized enveloping algebras, **II**, Prog. Theoret. Phys. **102** (1990), 175-201.